

O'NEILL LIBRARY
BOSTON COLLEGE

IRELAND AND HOME RULE

THERE are two methods of philosophising. One is to form a theory, and then twist the facts to fit it. The other is to collate the facts, and then draw conclusions from a comparison of them. The former method is the one commonly adopted, when Englishmen discuss Irish questions. They know what they desire, and their reasoning follows their wishes. This is an easy, but a very deceptive process. Suppose we follow the opposite plan ; and instead of making the facts square with a preconceived hypothesis, suppose we try to formulate a theory from the facts. I want to establish my conclusions by arguments as strong as adamant, and, to do so, it is necessary to unfold the tragic record of Irish wrongs, Irish sufferings and Irish misfortunes. It is a painful tale. I will only tell so much of it as stands in the relation of cause to effect. To prescribe remedies, without studying the seat of the disease and the habit of the patient, is empiricism and quackery.

Seven centuries ago we conquered Ireland. We have held Dublin nearly as long again as the Turks have held Constantinople. When we took it, Russia was a limited Dukedom, Germany was but a historical, and Italy was but a geographical expression. The English Kings still claimed supremacy over the greater part of France, and the Moors exercised it over Spain. In the interval, between the landing of Strongbow and the present time, Holland has risen to be the first of maritime Powers, and has sunk again into insignificance. The United States of America have been discovered and colonised, have won their independence, and have grown to be one of the greatest nations upon the earth. There has been time, then, sufficient for English institutions to take root in Ireland. Have they done so ? and what is the fruit they have grown ? Ireland is inferior to no other country in Europe in the gifts of Nature. It is blessed with a temperate climate and a productive soil ; it is intersected by great rivers ; it is indented with noble harbours ; it is endowed with valuable minerals ; it is possessed of prolific fisheries, and is furnished with water-power capable of turning the machinery of the world. Yet, its agriculture is stationary, and a couple of bad harvests bring the peasants to the verge of starvation. Its fisheries are neglected ; its minerals

are unworked ; its water-power is unused ; its commerce is languishing ; its manufactures, except in one district, are extinct ; and its population is poverty-stricken, dwindling and discontented. The people are disarmed, forbidden to drill, and refused permission to volunteer, while the country swarms with regular and irregular troops. This is the plain, unvarnished truth.

“When the herd degenerates, the herdsman is to blame,” is a maxim as old as Socrates. Ireland has degenerated under English rule. Is England to blame? Largely, I think. Scotland is prosperous, contented and loyal. How comes it, that our union with her has been such a success, and with Ireland such a failure? Because the first was a union and the second was a conquest. The Scotch Commissioners treated with the English Government on terms of equality for a junction of commercial interests—a federal connection, which should regulate the trade, and foreign relations of the two countries, but which left the laws and institutions of each untouched. The bargain was struck on those terms ; but under it the Scotch people have displayed a civic genius unsurpassed since the days of Pericles. They have transformed a barren soil into a garden, raised up arts and manufactures as by the wand of a magician, and metamorphosed one of the poorest countries in the world into one of the wealthiest. The Scotch have thriven, because we have allowed them to work out their own destiny in their own way. They have retained their own law-courts and legal methods, their own church, their own system of education, their own forms of local administration, and their own land and land-tenure. We have shown no such respect for Irish ways and wishes and susceptibilities. We have abrogated their laws and uprooted their courts. We have established a religion which was repugnant to them, and have forced them to support it. We have trampled out every vestige of local government, and centralised all power in an alien *camerilla* entrenched in Dublin Castle. We have confiscated their land, abolished their system of tenure, and cleared out the peasantry, as in a wild country they clear out the forests, to plant it with English adventurers. The different treatments explain the different results. “We have sown dragons’ teeth, and they have sprung up rebels.”

To-day is the child of yesterday. No man can pronounce an intelligent opinion on the state of Ireland, or propound any acceptable scheme for its amelioration, unless he has studied the past and understands the present. The ‘ ‘a-

mental facts of Irish history are unknown to the majority of Englishmen, who have been taught to apply different rules of conduct and canons of criticism to the two countries. Before English politicians denounce the Irish as ignorant and uncivilized, they should study the annals of those not remote times, during which education in Ireland was held to be felony by English law ; and before they proclaim Irish peasants to be a race of beggars and assassins, they should familiarise themselves with the history of Irish landlordism and of Irish law. It is not generally known, or, if known, it is overlooked, that Ireland, after the six centuries which follow the introduction of Christianity, was the seat of the industrial arts, and the school of the West. Residence there was considered essential to establish a literary reputation ; and to her seminaries and universities students flocked from every part of Christendom. They were Irish missionaries who first presented to the illiterate Saxon the rudiments of literature, science, architecture, music, and even the means of shaping the letters used in writing the English language. Irish monks were the workmen who built most of the early Christian edifices. Old St Paul's Cathedral, in London, and the magnificent roof that spans Westminster Hall, were of Irish design. At that time, Ireland was the Christian Greece—the centre of scholastic enlightenment and enterprise.

In the zenith of its reputation, it was ravaged and plundered by Pagan marauders, who desolated the country and disorganized its institutions. Intermittent wars, prolonged through centuries, demoralized the civilization which had been a beacon in the midst of darkness. A loose confederacy of princes and chiefs was substituted for the republican monarchy which had so long ruled with acceptance and success. Each sub-king fought for his own hand. Their reckless contests, combined with their dynastic jealousies, afforded an opening for filibustering Normans, who sought, and who soon found, a footing in the country. The Irish chieftains were dispossessed of their lands, and driven into the west. The invaders pitched on certain towns, and constructed around them rudely fortified camps, called the "Pale," whose boundaries were shifted according to circumstances. Within the scope of their forces, the Anglo-Normans established their own government, and imposed their own law. Beyond the Pale, the native prince ruled his principality, and the native chief ruled his clan. Fitfully, though gradually, the strangers pushed their power ; but it was not until more than four hundred years after the first landing

an army of skilled artizans out of France, have never heard how we drove 150,000 Irishmen into the Continental armies.

Such of the peasantry as survived successive settlements, as they were mildly called, were driven to the bogs and to the mountains. In the productive valleys and undulating meadows, the camp-followers of the conqueror were planted. The strangers took all that was worth having—the rest was left to the natives. The descendants of those strangers hold the same lands to-day, but they do not live on them. They are neither in the country, nor of it—aliens alike in creed and in social sympathy. The perversity that keeps these confiscations in mind is censured by complacent English critics. It is ancient history, they say, and should be forgotten. But defeated nations always dwell on the memories of old losses, even when traces of them are being gradually effaced. England, we are reminded, has been conquered more than once. That is true: but the conquerors absorbed the natives, or were absorbed by them. That has not happened in Ireland. We treated them as enemies to be extirpated, not as subjects to be conciliated. For any English settler to speak the native tongue, to use an Irish name, to wear the Irish apparel, or to adopt any of the customs of the country, was punishable by loss of his land; while for him to marry an Irishwoman, to trust his children to an Irish nurse, or to give them Irish sponsors at baptism, was constituted high treason. The racial barriers then erected have, unfortunately, not yet been overthrown; and both we and the Irish suffer in consequence. It is eight hundred years since the Normans parcelled out the English land. It is not three hundred since the English parcelled out the Irish. If Irish kings had planted Catholic settlements in choice English counties, as late as the time of the Commonwealth, and driven the Protestant English to the hills and fells, it would have been found that, even to this day, we would not have patiently acquiesced in the transfer. These memories are painful, but who can blot them out? As long as Englishmen gloat with patriotic pride over the records of great deeds done by their ancestors at Agincourt, or at Waterloo, so long will Irishmen, as Sir C. Gavan Duffy eloquently says, be disturbed by agony and wrath over the desolation of Desmond, the spoliation of Ulster, and the brutalities of Carhampton. England, too, is different from Ireland. Here we have many other occupations besides the agricultural. Ireland has none. Hence the earnestness with which her people bemoan the loss of their land. The race-resentments, then,

are traceable to the Pale: and the religious antipathies, engendered by our attempts to coerce the people, to Protestantism. The agrarian rancour comes down from the plantations: and the national distrust, from the penal laws, which, Mr. Burke says, were as elaborate a contrivance for the oppression, impoverishment and degradation of the people, and for the debasement of human nature, as ever proceeded from the perfidy and ingenuity of man.

But, although this generation suffers so severely from it, it is not responsible for the past. We cannot annul it, and we need not make party politics of it. But, if we wish to legislate in relief of the evil bequeathed to us, we must keep it before us. When we declaim against Irish ignorance, we should remember that, for generations, we prohibited education—that the penal laws left over four millions of persons unable to read. When we reproach the Irish with want of manufactures, we should recollect that we deliberately injured their manufactures in the interests of our own, and that one of William the Third's most solemn pledges to Parliament was, that he would do all that in him lay to destroy them. He kept this pledge, although he broke the one he made at Limerick. But no living Englishman has anything more to do with the enactment of the penal laws, or with the iniquity of the imposition of fatal restrictions on Irish trade, than any living Irishman has to do with the massacre of 1641. For the last fifty years, England has struggled to atone for former wrongs: and because her efforts have not been more effusively acknowledged by Ireland, the Irish are accused of ingratitude. It is not easy to define what measure of gratitude is due for tardy acts of justice. The English concessions have been shorn of their grace and merit by being so long delayed, and by being yielded to pressure rather than conviction and sympathy. Many of the concessions to Ireland have been carried out by hostile agents: others have been allowed to remain inoperative, or have been administered in a recalcitrant spirit. The American War stimulated the English sense of justice. In the hope of averting an Irish rebellion, we gave Ireland a Parliament: and, as usual, we sweetened the gift by a general admission of past transgressions. The Parliament was to rectify past errors, and redress wrongs: but no sooner did the danger, which it was called into existence to prevent, disappear, than it was corruptly and fraudulently destroyed. Catholic Emancipation was promised as a *salarium* for the loss—but it was not granted until thirty years after the Union, and then only under compulsion. The Duke of

Wellington, when urging the measure on his brother Peers, did not do so that justice might be accomplished, and the long delayed debt paid, but because it was no longer safe to resist. "We have," he said, "to choose between emancipation and rebellion ; and I prefer the former, as the less evil of the two." No one can wonder that the gratitude of Irishmen was not touched by such questionable generosity. The glaring injustice of maintaining a Protestant Church at the cost of the Catholic people was admitted by all ; but it was maintained for generations, and, according to the acknowledgment of the author of the Act, was only finally disestablished because the Fenians blew down a gaol-wall in Clerkenwell, and burst open a police-van in Manchester. It was fear, not justice, that secured that reform. A like indifference to agrarian evils was displayed, until they were positively driven in upon our consideration. In the copious election programmes, of both great parties, in 1880, there was no reference to the reiterated demand of Irish peasants for a redress of their grievances. When they were spoken of by isolated English "Philistines" it was to sneer at, or jest about, them ; but when the Land League paralysed the Castle and its constables, a very different tone was taken. Then the necessity for an Irish Land Act was discovered, and one was passed by the English Parliament in hot haste. When well-meaning Englishmen are chagrined and perplexed, that their efforts at reparative justice are not more warmly reciprocated, and do not strike a responsive chord in Irish hearts, they may find a reason in this retrospect. It is not the deed itself which is done, but the time when, and the temper in which, it is done, that captivates the recipient.

Acts, too, good and wise in themselves, have failed from defective and adverse administration. We made the Catholics eligible for office; but we admitted none of them to it. We opened the door; but not a soul was permitted to pass. During the debates on the Emancipation Bill, Sir Robert Peel said, "Catholics are eligible; but because they are eligible, they are not entitled to office. Whether they are admitted or not, is in the discretion of the Crown." In other words, the legal ban was lifted, but the social ban was retained. And so it is to this day ! In the county of Cork, where there are ten Catholics for one Protestant, there were, a few years ago, in offices of honour and emolument in connection with the Government—the magistracy, the poor-law and the police —1,190 Protestant and 185 Catholics. In a lately published report it is shown that, whilst there are 227 Protestant, there

are only 45 Catholic officers in the Irish Constabulary. It is an advantage to have the Constitution broadened ; but the benefit is neutralised, if, when Catholics seek admission, they are told there is no room for them ; and that all the places are filled by Protestants, who have secured an entrance in right of confiscated land and penal laws. This class and sectarian exclusiveness—the spawn of prejudice and injustice—applies to every department, from Dublin Castle to the local police-barrack. From the year 1700 to 1800, only one Irishman filled the office of Lord-Lieutenant. Since 1800, only two—and these were Tory noblemen—have been Viceroys.

The Chief Secretary and the Under Secretary are Englishmen and Protestants ; and out of the twenty-nine officials in the Castle all are Protestants but two. In the Customs, in the Inland Revenue, and in the offices of the Board of Works, all the chief places are filled by Protestants. The minor ones are given to Catholics. And this is half-a-century after Emancipation, and amongst a population where only one in five is Protestant. It is impossible to conceive that there are not a large number of Irish Catholics eligible for these places, and that they were excluded through a latent distrust, or a desire to maintain the old ascendancy. In Eastern rivers, you trace, by their colour, the waters that rise in different geological strata. Their courses are distinguishable from their source to the sea. The streams of Irish discontent, springing from different well-heads, are quite as broadly marked. Angry and venomous currents, racial, religious and agrarian, have guttered into and undermined its national life. The Irish policy of the Plantagenets was oppression and hostility ; and of the Tudors, the sword and penal statutes. The Irish policy of Cromwell was the sword, penalties and wholesale confiscation ; and that of William and Anne was the sword, repression, renewed confiscation and laws against trade. They all failed. The Hanoverians initiated a more humane policy. The sword was temporarily returned to the scabbard. Proselytism, accompanied by restraints and disabilities, was tried. They were “to be taught to fear, that they might be taught to love.” This failed too. A new departure was taken at the date of Emancipation. A policy of alternate coercion and concession—the lash and lollipops—was started. It has failed also. Our measures are never thorough. They are always clogged with reservations. We always leave a splinter in the wound. And we stand now, eighty-five years after the Union, in the presence of as intense and widespread disaffection as has ever

moved the Irish people during this century. We have attempted all forms of rule but one. We have never trusted Irishmen.

Why not try that? Give them—and by *them* I mean all classes, irrespective of creeds and origin—the management of their own affairs. What they want, is the right to domestic legislation. The Imperial Parliament would then, as now, have the exclusive power of dealing with all questions affecting the Crown ; of legislating for the colonies and dependencies ; of regulating our relations with foreign States ; of providing and controlling the supplies for national defences ; of upholding the integrity and stability of the Empire. Amongst the attributes of sovereignty would be the right of coining money, of carrying the mail, of regulating the customs, of granting patents and copyrights, and of making wars. The Irish Parliament would deal exclusively with Irish affairs. Its Constitution would be a counterpart of the Imperial. Irish Ministers would be responsible to their Parliament, as their Parliament, in turn, would be responsible to the people. While they constitutionally exercised jurisdiction over all purely Irish business, they would be required cordially to unite with England in proceedings which concerned the two islands in common. The Imperial Parliament would act for the Empire ; and the Irish Parliament would act for Ireland. Each, within its sphere, would be supreme. Is there anything unreasonable, or impracticable, or revolutionary in such an arrangement? It was because we refused to adopt it for our American colonies, that we lost them. It is because we have adopted it in our other large colonies, that we retain them.

Federalism is but the application to national life of the principle that we act upon in domestic and civil life. Each family regulates its domestic affairs ; each municipality manages its own business—because they can do so with more knowledge, and will do so with more zeal, than any outside individual, or any distant governing body. But, as regards matters of general concern in the State, the members of the municipality respectively act in unison. The fullest growth, and the widest range of action, both in the individual and in the city, as well as in the country, is compatible with fidelity to the State. Fidelity and independence, in the centre, can be maintained without sacrificing either in the different parts. Every member of the body politic would have free and healthy play ; and the life of the whole would be the life of every section. That procedure I would apply to the political

relations between England and Ireland. The earliest forms of political union rest, not upon territorial contiguity, but upon blood relationship. In the lowest savagery, as well as in the highest civilisation—in the old clan, as in the new nationality—this is the primary, as it is the strongest, ground for sustained common action amongst groups of men. We have not yet reached that condition of positive knowledge when we can say, with an assurance of correctness, how much of progress is due to innate race qualities, and how much to early and later environments. The chief problem of civilisation has always been how to secure concentrated action amongst men, on a large scale, without sacrificing local independence, or without doing violence to national sentiment. History says, it is not possible to solve this problem without the aid of the principle of representation applied equally to the different communities in the same State, and to the different citizens of the same community. This association of equal men and equal peoples, mutually aiding one another, each profiting by the resources which the other possesses, and marching onward, free from all fetters, to the realisation of their destiny—indicated by their aspirations, by the locality of their birth, by their tradition and idioms—this is the highest form of political organisation which human experience has evolved ; and it is specially adapted to the peculiar relations between England and Ireland.

This is in accordance, too, with Anglo-Saxon sentiments and sympathies. They were the only race that came out of the mediæval crucible with their conceptions of local Government intact. England itself was a confederation of States, rather than a united kingdom. The federation was not only of shire and shire, and of province with province, but of realm and realm. All the groups were subordinate, but all were free. They all acknowledged an imperial supremacy. Yet, for all local and administrative purposes, they were independent. Over the Confederated States presided a King, and round him stood the Council of Wise Men. It was out of this organisation that our Empire grew ; and by this organisation it is still guarded. The genius and training of the English people, then, as well as their political and social structures, are all in harmony with the federalists' idea. Centralisation, the Roman idea, is despotic. Federation, the Teutonic idea, is democratic. It was the communities that embraced the latter conception of governing—the Dutch and the Swiss and the Scandinavians—that led the terrible battle for freedom with which the drama of modern history was ushered in ; and it is they who have

shown capacity for the completest form of local self-government, combined with federal union. In their mountain fastnesses, the Swiss have preserved the rustic democracy of their fore-fathers. Yet, modern Switzerland is made up of more discordant and unmanageable elements than are to be found in Great Britain and Ireland. Four languages—German, French, Italian, Rhœtian—are spoken within the limits of the Confederacy; while, on religion, the Cantons are as sharply divided as ever Orangemen, or Catholics, are, or can be. But deeper down than even the deep-seated differences of speech and creed, lie the patriotic feelings generated by the common possession of political freedom. Complete local independence, and adequate federal representation, give a more intense national cohesion than any centralised Government, however cunningly devised, can secure. Identical results, in very different circumstances and under very different conditions, have been secured in democratic Scandinavia and in autocratic Austria. There are no two countries in Europe whose course has been freer from domestic discord, or more steadily prosperous, than Norway and Sweden since their confederation; and when Austria ceased to be the master, and became partner with Hungary in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, chronic discontent was transformed into settled contentment.

But the happiest illustration of dual government—the most conclusive proof that concentrated action can be secured without sacrifice of independent action—is furnished by the United States of America. When it was proposed, it was laughed at and derided in much the same way as Home Rule is to-day. It was declared to be impossible that thirteen colonies, with a population of five millions, would overcome their mutual jealousies so far as to unite in a single political body. Yet, not thirteen, but thirty-nine, free States—stretching over more than three millions of square miles of territory, and containing not five, but fifty, millions of people, as unlike as Connecticut and California, or as Louisiana and Massachusetts—have been united, and are held together in bonds as firm as they are free. It is in the flexibility of the union, in the complete independence that is preserved by each State, except when independence conflicts with the federal principle, that lies the surest guarantee for this masterpiece of political wisdom. But, in the British Empire itself, we have an example of federation in another, but equally successful, form. We have accorded to all our larger colonies the full power of Self Government; and we are gradually evolving a comprehen-

hensive federation which will secure to each all the local rights which they now enjoy: while it will bind them, both by interest and good-will, still more tightly to the Imperial community. It is impossible to cite more conclusive evidence of the success of Home Rule than that presented by the Dominion of Canada. For the first forty years of the century, that colony was either in rebellion, or preparing for rebellion. It is two thousand miles from our shores, or forty times the distance of Ireland. It is close to a great and friendly State, which is certainly not unwilling to incorporate it. It has two provinces; and the people of each differ in race, religion, language and law. Those in one province are French and Catholic, alienated by memories of recent conquests and harsh legislation. The population of the other—Scotch and Irish settlers—have carried with them inveterate race-feuds and religious animosities. It is not easy to conceive of a country where, or a population amongst whom, Home Rule could have been less auspiciously attempted. The two provinces were united in the one Parliament, with all the elements of distraction, disaffection and danger. Has the Empire been disintegrated? Has the Dominion joined, or does it now ever talk of joining, the United States? Is it torn by domestic dissension? Has not Home Rule transformed a rebellious and languishing colony into one of the most loyal, contented and prosperous that Great Britain possesses? Provinces that were against each other, in seemingly hopeless discord and antagonism, are now united. French Catholic and Irish Orangemen, English Catholic and Scotch Presbyterians, meet in one Parliament, and subordinate their strifes and rivalries to the common interest of the country which they control, and the Empire of which they form a part. It is the practice of party politicians to complicate what is simple, and to make inextricable what is not complex; but it is not conceivable that intelligent Englishmen can, or will, permit themselves to be permanently prejudiced against a system of rule, the merits of which they have not fully investigated. I have no faith in my powers of advocacy; but I feel satisfied that if I had twelve of my countrymen—of any class, or creed, or party—in the jury-box; and if they allowed me, as Dean Swift wished to do, to plead the case under another name, they would pronounce the Irish grievances proven, and decide that their scheme for Self Government was in principle sound, and would in practice be workable.

In Ireland's chequered history, there was a brief period of

prosperity. The American War brought England trouble, but brought Ireland liberty. This was the first time, since the invasion of Henry II., that she had had free-trade and a free Parliament. In the twenty years that followed the restoration of her independence, she made great strides in prosperity. Freedom brought her trade and revived her manufactures. Lord Clare, in 1798, said : "There is not a nation on the globe that has advanced in cultivation and commerce, in agriculture and manufactures, with the same rapidity in the same period." All classes of the community—Protestant and Catholic, peer and peasant, rich and poor—were united in one bond of sympathy, and one common sentiment of triumph, at the legislative independence of the country. But, that Parliament was destroyed by a combination of perfidy and corruption, to which the British annals furnish no parallel. Since the Union, Irish history has been a record of repression and of turbulence—repression on account of turbulence, and turbulence on account of repression. There have been, in the eighty-five years, nearly fifty Coercion Bills ; and there have not been, over that long period, three successive years in which the Constitution has not been suspended. The population has steadily decreased. It is four millions less than it was in 1847. There have been three positive famines, and repeated periods when distress bordered on famine. Trade has declined. Manufactures have all but expired. Agriculture has retrograded. Only two things have increased—pauperism and discontent. Discontent flows from injustice, as surely as heat from fire. How long has this state of affairs to continue? How long is Ireland to be a menace and a danger, instead of a source of strength and security, to the Empire? Can any valid reason be given, why we cannot give her the liberty we so fraudulently deprived her of eighty-five years ago? She was prosperous under her own rule. She is miserable under ours. It is marvellous to see liberal-minded and intelligent Englishmen ignoring the fact, written in blood over the chronicles of twenty generations, that Ireland will never be contented until she is ruled by Irishmen, as uniformly as England is ruled by Englishmen. Her national sentiment is an anvil that will wear out many hammers. Her history forms a long battle for this end. All her heroes are men who have fought for her. All her poetry is filled with legends of their struggles ; and we can only extinguish the idea by extinguishing the population.

It will dissolve the Empire to give Irishmen Home Rule, say some. Those who say so must have forgotten that already

there are fifteen Parliaments in the British dominions ; and it cannot be seriously contended that the making of one more will make the difference between unity and dismemberment. But Home Rule, I hold, will consolidate and strengthen, not weaken, the Empire. Whatever Irish policy they may pro-ound, all parties are agreed that Ireland is disaffected. We may disagree both as to the cause of, and as to the cure for the disaffection ; but, as to the disaffection itself, there can be no doubt. A great war with a great Power, or a rebellion in India, would convert a vague sentiment into a purpose and a passion. No captain can safely lead his ship into action, unless he feels confidence in the fidelity of his crew. There could be no confidence in an Irish crew, in their present temper, if the Empire were to get into trouble. Our difficulty would be Ireland's opportunity. Her slumbering disloyalty would be militant, and another Paul Jones might make a descent on Mayo, or another Hoche might attempt, and this time might succeed, in landing at Bantry Bay. Both would find sympathisers on shore. Most of us have forgotten that, so late as 1840, the French Government consulted Irish rebel soldiers as to the feasibility of a military expedition to Ireland ; and the Prince de Joinville, son of Louis Philippe, published a pamphlet to show how easily it could be accomplished. During our strained relations with the United States, at the time of the Tyler and Polk Presidencies, schemes for invading Ireland, and for attacking Canada with Irish help, were openly discussed. Sir Robert Peel justified his attempt to conciliate the Irish Catholics, by establishing a national system of education, by partially endowing Maynooth, and in founding the Queen's Colleges, on the ground that war was possible both with America and France, and that until Ireland was contented, our diplomacy was hampered, and our powers of resistance were paralysed. What has been, may be. We are very wisely constructing additional coaling-stations abroad, and fortifying our harbours at home ; but forts, docks, arsenals, battlements, mounds and artillery, are of little avail unless they have fervent and stalwart men to defend them. We can, by a simple act of justice, turn four millions of lukewarm or hostile Irishmen into active friends, and build around their section of the kingdom a patriotic and puissant rampart, which will as far excel all artificial batteries as men excel brutes, or brutes excel material nature.

Why do we not do it ? "Because," whisper nervous politicians, "if we left the rival factions to themselves, they

would tear each other to pieces, and, in the wrangle, the interests of the Protestant and property minority would be endangered." I do not believe it. There is no justification for such fears. Religion ought not to divide a nation; and the Catholic majority need not alarm Protestant Irishmen. Why should it? Belgium is a Catholic country; and the religious liberty of Protestants is as secure there as it is in England. There are keener clerical controversies in Switzerland than in Ireland; yet the freedom of all is recognised and respected. Churches, like monarchs, are apt to be tempted into persecuting practices when they possess uncontrolled power. It is a fact, however, to be cited to the honour of Irish Catholics, that on two occasions—during the reigns of Queen Mary and James—they had the opportunity of retaliating, and they refrained from doing so. Their fathers had been mercilessly treated by Cromwell; but, notwithstanding, James' Irish Parliament displayed unique moderation and absolute forbearance. They inflicted no penalties for religious opinions. They ordered the tithes payable by Protestant farmers to be paid to the Protestant, and the tithes payable by Catholic farmers to be paid to the Catholic clergy. They did not deprive the Protestants of arms, nor of the franchise; nor impose upon them such penal laws as had been relentlessly levied against themselves, their religion, their property, their family peace, and their political and civil rights. On the other hand, many of the influential Irish Nationalists have been Protestants. The Volunteers, whose action secured the Parliament of 1782, met in the Protestant church of Dungannon, and their chiefs were of that faith. The Constitutional leaders—Grattan and his colleagues—and the leaders of the United Irishmen—Wolfe Tone and Orr and their associates—were Protestants. So, too, were prominent men among the Young Irelanders—Smith O'Brien, Mitchel, Davis, Martin; while all the Parliamentary leaders the Home Rule party have had—Mr. Butt, Mr. Shaw and Mr. Parnell—have been Protestants. In any scheme for an Irish Parliament, the rights of the Protestants will have to be guaranteed. But, there would be no more difficulty in doing that, than there has been in assuring the rights of the Catholic minority in Canada. Christianity belongs exclusively to no sect, and patriotism to no religion.

Irishmen are asked to point to the measures that an Irish Parliament will pass, and that an Imperial Parliament will not. This is the cant of despotism. It is what Austria told the Lombards, what the Germans told the Alsatians, and what

the Czar tells the Poles. The Austrians and the Russians and the Germans may mean to rule their conquered provinces for their good—I do not say that they do so—but the Poles and the Alsatians prefer to rule themselves, even though they may not rule so cleverly. That is also the reply of Irishmen. They say: “We do not deny the competency of the British Parliament, but it has enough work of its own to do ; it cannot do what we want, however able or however willing it may be. Leave us to attend to our business ; and you will have more time to attend to yours. We are a smaller people and a poorer one, but we have interests you do not understand, and wants that you do not know of, or if you do, that you cannot legislate for. We know where the shoe pinches ; we require a new pair that will fit our feet, and we want to make them ourselves.” That is the Irish contention. Is it not a reasonable one?

It is not true, however, that Irish measures are promptly passed in the British Parliament. They are passed in earnest only when they become the instruments of party warfare, or when popular discontent develops into insurrection, and the noblest spirits become rebels. But, their complaint is not so much about specific measures as it is against the whole system of Government. It crushes the energy, it wastes the strength, it destroys the spirit, it neglects the interest, it contravenes the sentiments of the people. A nation is a moral essence, and its feelings are facts. The sense of national pride, the inherited tendencies of generations, the recollections of former grievances, the fame which they wish to enhance, the independence which they wish to guard, are as much realities as wealth, or national power. They make up the soul and spirit of the nation. It is futile to attribute, as some do, the perennial movement in Ireland to agitators who transmit from one to another the inheritance of subversive ideas. They might as well attribute the conquest of the world, by Christianity, to the underground labour of secret societies.

I have reasoned out my conclusions without reference to pending party controversy. Some of these may modify and others may aggravate the situation ; but they are distinct from the over-mastering contention that controls all Irish agitations—that, while forming part of the British Empire and relegating all questions of Imperial interest to the Imperial Parliament, they should manage their own affairs in their own way. It is this principle that has given such boundless vitality to

our colonial enterprise ; and however conciliation may lure, or coercion may threaten, there will be no peace in Ireland until this is granted. During the late Government's term of office, Ireland passed through the old sad drama—starvation, conspiracy, murder, arrest and trial. It opened as usual with the razed cabin, and closed with the penal cell and the gallows' drop. The Ministers, equally as usual, stuck a plaster on the raw sore, and affected astonishment that the patient winced under the infliction. The Land Act reduces rents, but does not stop evictions. Over 60,000 peasants have been turned out of their homes and holdings since it was passed. This year, the evicted persons numbered nearly 18,000. The Act benefited a section of the better class farmers, but it has not touched the most necessitous ; whilst the Coercion Acts have done more to embitter Irish feeling against England than any measure passed by the British Legislature this century.

In conclusion, I will only add that the Irish cause, which is a subject for a sneer to the political "Philistine," has always had for me an irresistible fascination. The Irish Celt, whom English caricaturists usually picture either as a gorilla, or a baboon, has noble qualities. He loves the scenes where he was born, and the roof which sheltered him from birth. He is a dutiful son, a faithful husband and a kind father. He is patient in suffering, and unwavering in trust, when trust is given. Like Ixion at his wheel, he eternally traces the same circle of woes. He tills a few sad acres for bare life, wears a few poor rags for bare warmth, and he softens the hard leaven of his lot with the dews of a simple faith in heaven. The chivalry, the romance, the tenderness and the faithfulness of his nature have often captivated his conquerors, and turned the descendants of English planters into the foremost of Irish patriots ; and it has made one member of the British Parliament, at the least, as faithful a friend of their cause, as ever the green flag of Ireland fluttered over.

British Home Rule Association

PROVISIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Chairman.

THE EARL OF ASHBURNHAM, 30, Dover Street, W.

Vice-Chairman.

JOSEPH COWEN, ESQ., M.P., 23, Onslow Square, S.W.

Committee.

BLUNT, Wilfrid, S., Esq., 10, James Street,
Buckingham Gate, S.W.

CLARK, G. B., Esq., M.D., M.P., Fenwick,
West Dulwich, S.E.

CLIFTON, Lord, Dumpton, Ramsgate.

EDMUND, W. MARTIN, Esq., 24, Great
Cumberland Place, W.

JONES, Rev. J. S., Vicarage, St. Philip's,
Clerkenwell, W.C.

KENYON, John G., Esq., 24, Dorset
Square, N.W.

LUCAS, Edward, Esq., Fern Lodge, Brook
Green, Hammersmith, W.

MARSHALL, Sir James, Richmond House,
Roehampton Park, S.W.

SHIPLEY, Orby, Esq., 39, Thurloe Square, S.W.

THOMPSON, Thomas C., Esq., Ashdown
Park, Forest Row, Sussex.

(With power to add to their number.)

Joint Honorary Treasurers.

Sir James MARSHALL; and Thomas C. THOMPSON, Esq.

Joint Honorary Secretaries.

W. MARTIN-EDMUND, Esq.; E. W. HOPE, Esq.; and John G. KENYON, Esq.

(*To whom all communications may be addressed.*)

116, Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, Westminster, S.W.

Publication Sub-Committee.

Rev. J. S. JONES; E. LUCAS, Esq.; and Orby SHIPLEY, Esq.

(*To whom communications may be addressed.*)

Bankers.

THE NATIONAL BANK (Limited), Charing Cross Branch. 9 & 10, Charing Cross, S.W.

Offices of the Association.

116, PALACE CHAMBERS, BRIDGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

The following account is reprinted, with corrections, from THE TIMES of February 11th, 1886.

YESTERDAY afternoon, Wednesday, February 10th, 1886, a meeting, convened by circular as a meeting "of Englishmen and Scotchmen favourable to the principle of the establishment of an Irish Parliament in Dublin for Irish affairs," was held at the Westminster Palace Hotel, "with a view to discuss the policy of starting some Association to promote that object." The circular was signed by W. Scawen Blunt, G. B. Clark, M.P., Joseph Cowen, M.P., and Edward Lucas.

Among those who attended were the Earl of Ashburnham, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Nottingham, Lord Clifton, Mr. Cowen, M.P., Mr. Wilfrid S. Blunt, Sir James Marshall, the Revs. H. V. Arkell, Angelo Lucas, J. S. Jones, W. F. Traies, J. W. Barth, and Messrs. Caithness Brodie, W. Martin-Edmunds, Orby Shipley, John G. Kenyon, E. W. Hope, T. Bateman Napier, James Britten, W. H. Kelke, Edward Lucas, Richard Congreve, Thomas C. Thompson, Edward Walford, S. Glennie, W. H. R. Ashford, W. Clarke, J. P. Bannin, L. Greenberg, J. Rae, J. E. Hawksford, E. T. Bennett, J. Sims, and others. Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., was also present by special invitation.

The Earl of Ashburnham was elected to the chair.

Several letters were received from gentlemen unable to attend, and they were generally favourable to some united effort to influence English opinion.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, said :—I beg to thank you very sincerely for the honour which you have done me in calling me to preside over your deliberations. If I rightly understand the intention with which we are assembled here to-day, we do not stand absolutely committed to advocate the establishment of an Irish Parliament, nor indeed of any other particular form of government for Ireland ; but we are of opinion, that the time has come when the Irish question must be settled. We think that the Irish people ought to have at least the chief voice in its settlement ; and we have heard that voice, so far as it has reached us, through the ordinary constitutional channels raised in favour of a Parliament in Dublin. We are, therefore, favourably inclined rather than otherwise towards that solution of the difficulty. Such, at least, is my own position, and such are my reasons for coming here to-day. Now, I think we may all say, some more and some less, that we have come here at some small risk to ourselves. We may hope that time will justify us ; but at present, I fear that the only indulgence which we can look for from our fellow-countrymen is that which may be granted to us as a small and insignificant body, altogether unworthy of serious notice ; and I am afraid that, if we receive any notice at all, it will come to us in the shape of hard names, which, though they may break no bones, are nevertheless apt to inflict very painful bruises. Nothing can be more odious, more intolerable, to loyal and patriotic subjects than to be held up to public reprobation as unpatriotic and disloyal ; yet, I fear, gentlemen, that we must be prepared for this. We may, of course, and shall, repel the charge with indignation ; but this will not be enough. We must also be prepared to disprove it ; and we can only do this by acquiring a very complete knowledge of the foundation upon which it is based. It seems to me that this foundation consists principally of two mere assertions, one or both of which are taken for granted by all the opponents of the Irish cause. It is alleged, that the Irish people care nothing for Home Rule by itself, and that they merely hope to use it as a first step towards a complete severance of Ireland from the British Empire and its establishment as an independent and hostile Power. Some people even go so far as to speak of a possible annexation by some foreign Power. It is alleged, that the beginning of an Irish Parliament would be plunder ; its middle state, anarchy ; and its end, civil war. Now, gentlemen, if I believed either of these allegations, I should not be here now ; neither would you, if you believed them ; for the glorious inheritance of our great Empire and the sacred rights of private property are treasures which it is not only our interest, but also our duty to defend. But, we do not believe these allegations ; and, speaking for myself, I am prepared to say that, even if I suspected that they might possibly turn out true, I should still be disposed to give the Irish people a fair chance of proving these suspicions unfounded ; and this could only be done by granting them what they ask for. And I do not see what great harm could result from it, at the worst, because what we give we can take away ; and if the Irish Parliament should show itself to be the reprobate assembly which we are told to expect, we shall certainly, as Englishmen and Scotchmen, be as eager then for its suppression as we can possibly

be now for its establishment. In the meantime, as I have already said, we are favourably disposed towards the scheme ; and we are assembled to-day to consider and discuss, whether or not we shall co-operate to give to our theoretical principles some practical expression.

Mr. WILFRID S. BLUNT, after some remarks on the objects of the proposed Association and the methods of carrying them by lectures, speeches, and publications, moved a resolution in the following terms :—“That this meeting is of opinion that the cause of justice and the Empire’s best interests will be served by supporting the Irish people in their demand for legislative government, and in this view agrees to the founding of an association to be called the British Home Rule Association.”

In the course of a general conversation, many remarks were made as to the sympathy manifested by English meetings with the aspirations of Irishmen for more complete Self Government ; and the effect which fuller information as to the history and government of Ireland would have on the course of public opinion in this country. It was urged that, in order to do the work of the proposed Association, it was not necessary to commit it to any particular plan of Home Rule.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN, M.P., said they were agreed as to the principle of Home Rule. How that principle was to be carried out, was a point upon which there were great differences of opinion. Some were in favour of the application to Ireland of the Hungarian system; others, of the Colonial system; others, of the establishment of the Parliament of 1782, with modifications. That meeting, however, was not called upon to decide these points. All to which they were required to give assent, was the principle of Self Government to Ireland. And by Self Government they did not mean merely allowing the Irish people to have the management of roads, bridges, and other works under the control of the Grand Juries; nor did they mean the establishment of Provincial Councils, such as had been suggested fifty years ago by Lord John Russell. What they did mean was this—that they should hand over to the Irish people the management of those of their affairs which did not conflict with the integrity of the Empire. This could only be done, as he understood it, by the formation of an Irish Parliament. How the Parliament was to be established, how the local and imperial interests were to be harmonized — were matters for discussion and consideration. But, this the promoters of the meeting wished to say—that they assented to no scheme which would impair the integrity of the Empire, or would in any way invalidate the security of property. On these two points they were as firmly agreed, as they were in their desire to have the principle of Self Government conceded. There were many men in England, able and experienced men in public affairs, who believed that these things were incompatible ; that there could not be a Parliament in Ireland, without impairing the integrity of the Empire and without imperilling the security of property. It would be their duty, as an Association, to demonstrate to opponents that they were wrong on these questions. The mass of hostile opinion in

this country was based upon ignorance and supported by prejudice. The object of this society would be, to disseminate information by which the ignorant would be enlightened and prejudices would be removed. They would do that in a legitimate and educational manner.

Mr. JUSTIN McCARTHY, M.P., being invited to address the meeting, said the Irish party would be exceedingly grateful for any help which an Association of this kind could render them in England. He and other Irish Members were overwhelmed with letters every morning making inquiries as to what Home Rule meant, and what Home Rule would involve ; and if an Association of this kind would undertake the work of educating English public opinion, it would do an invaluable service, provided it began its educational work early enough. He was certain, on the part of the Home Rule party, that there was not the slightest desire to impair the integrity of the Empire, or do anything which would involve the confiscation of property. He further believed that, under Home Rule, the freedom of Protestants would be as complete as it was at the present time, that there was not the slightest desire on the part of any Catholics, identified with the Home Rule movement, to diminish the toleration which now existed, or in any way to interfere with the perfect freedom of their Protestant fellow-countrymen. The first Home Rule leader, Mr. Butt, was a Protestant ; the second, Mr. Shaw, was a Protestant ; the third, Mr. Parnell, was a Protestant. He knew that Mr. Davitt, who represented the high-water mark of the Home Rule movement, was prepared for the settlement of the land question on the lines laid down by Mr. Giffen. The question had been raised whether Ulster should be conceded a separate Home Rule of its own ; but he said, the people of Ulster had already answered that question for themselves, by returning Members in favour of the Home Rule party, and he believed that if a *plébiscite* of the people were taken, the same result would follow.

It was pointed out by a gentleman, that the resolution did not do justice to the sentiments of the meeting, nor lay a foundation for the work of the proposed Association, which was to encounter and remove certain prejudices existing in England and Scotland. He suggested a preamble to the resolution. The preamble met with general approval. It was adopted by Mr. Blunt ; and the resolution, seconded by the Bishop of Nottingham, was unanimously agreed to, in the following form :—“ That this meeting firmly believes that Self Government can be granted to the Irish nation without impairing the integrity of the Empire, or the supremacy of the Crown ; and without involving the risk of confiscation, or the sacrifice of the rights of property : that this meeting, therefore, is of opinion, that the cause of justice and the Empire’s best interests will be served, by supporting the Irish people in their demand for Self Government, and in this view agrees to the formation of an Association to be called the British Home Rule Association.”

An Executive Committee was appointed to organise the Association. Subscriptions were announced, amounting to between £200 and £300.

The meeting then separated after a prolonged conference.

HOME RULE.

BY

EDWARD SPENCER BEESLY,

Professor of History in University College, London.

“And Pharaoh said, I will let you go; only ye shall not go very far away.”—EXODUS viii. 28.

TENTH THOUSAND.

London:

REEVES & TURNER, 196, STRAND.

—
1886.

[Price One Penny.]

HOME RULE.

I do not desire the complete separation of Ireland from England, but I do not fear it. The two countries have many interests in common, both public and private ; and if they can arrange some terms of union which shall be acceptable to each, and shall give to each the inestimable advantage of Home Rule, it will be a happy consummation. But sooner than go on as we have been doing for the last hundred years, and especially for the last ten years, I should welcome complete separation.

The object of these pages is to advocate self-government for both countries. I say for both countries. For who is so simple, such a slave of phrases, as to maintain that England enjoys self-government, when Ireland has a veto upon English legislation. Not indeed a veto in theory ; I could bear that with much equanimity ; but what is far more galling, a practical and most real veto ; a veto which is felt at every turn and which will certainly continue to be felt as long as the union is maintained in its present form.

What a blinded fanatic that man must be—I do not care whether he is a costermonger or an ex-Cabinet Minister—who can find in our nominal government of Ireland any set off against her real government of England. At the present moment it is her yoke which galls us, not ours which galls her. Just let us reckon up how it works.

What do the bulk of Irishmen most want ? There is no sort of doubt about it. They want, in Mr. Parnell's words, to keep a firm grip of their homesteads, and to pay only such rent as in their own judgment they can afford.

Well, they are practically doing just that. There are thirty-two millions of us to less than five millions of them. But we cannot collect those rents, and we cannot evict the tenants. We have tried it, and we have had to give

it up as a bad job. It was practically given up when Mr. Morley said that he would not send the redcoats to support the crowbar brigade except when he thought proper.

Some people complained that this was very arbitrary talk. But what says the discontented Mr. Chamberlain, who cannot bring himself to surrender the proud supremacy of the Imperial Parliament? He would make a law to suspend all evictions, and advance the amount of the non-recoverable rents to the landlords out of the public treasury—that is to say, out of Englishmen's pockets—till a settlement can be arrived at. Poor John Bull must grin and bear it, content with such satisfaction as he can get out of the reflection that he still continues to “govern Ireland.” Odds whips and scorpions! if that is the Birmingham alternative to the Land Purchase Bill, I had rather forego the honour. I like not such grinning honour.

Ireland then has practically got her way already. The supremacy of the Imperial Parliament is nominally intact. Only, the Queen's writ does not run; and Mr. Chamberlain, to save appearances, will make a law that it shall not run.

But if the English yoke on Ireland has come in these days of Carnarvon and Morley to be easy, and its burden practically light, the Irish yoke on England is a reality of the sternest kind. We have a string of reforms waiting to be carried, and a huge Liberal majority of ninety-six (excluding all Irish members) prepared to carry them. But the Irish (whom we have the proud satisfaction of governing) prohibit us from touching them. A London Municipality? Veto. Secular Education for Board Schools? Veto. County Boards, Land Law Reform, Railway Reform, Water Supply Reform, Enfranchisement of Leaseholds, Wind-up of City Companies? Veto. Veto. Veto.

None of these questions can even be effectively submitted to public opinion outside Parliament. For such is the block of Reforms waiting for legislation that the public will not nowadays bend itself to the serious con-

sideration of any one of them until its turn for consideration in Parliament is seen to have arrived. People will not waste their time on projects of law which may have to wait years before they can be dealt with. In the meantime, 556 members for Great Britain are kept slaving at Irish questions, great and small, in which the mass of British electors neither have nor feel the slightest interest. This may be very glorious. It may enable Her Majesty the Queen and Empress to hold her head some inches higher among the sovereigns of Europe. It may inflate an upper-class Englishman with a sense of imperial grandeur. But it is time the ordinary elector, the working man and the small tradesman, asked himself how he is a gainer by it.

“What an ignoble ideal,” cries a West-End journalist, “is this that you are holding up before the workman! Are great questions of policy, on which all educated men agree, to be treated from his purely personal standpoint?”

In the first place, Mr. West-End journalist, all educated men are *not* agreed, as you know very well. But let that pass. “Education,” as you understand the word, has very little connection with political insight, and still less with true patriotism. What you mean by educated men, are people whose parents could afford to send them to schools and colleges, from which most of them brought away nothing in the way of education but a wretched smattering of dead languages and mathematics. Say “well-to-do people” at once, for that is what you mean. Well, they have had the management of England hitherto, and we see what they have made of it—a very pleasant country for well-to-do people. In future, the working class are going to have, I do not say the management of England—I am well aware that except in very exceptional moments they will never have that—but considerable influence over its management; and you may depend upon it that they will try to make England a somewhat pleasanter place for the working class than it has been hitherto.

There happens to be an important difference between the “personal stand-point” of the workman and that of the well-to-do citizen. It has been thus expressed by

Auguste Comte. "The working class is not, properly speaking, a class at all, but constitutes the body of society. From it proceed the various special classes, which we may regard as organs necessary to that body." From which it follows that any political or social arrangements which are for the true and permanent advantage of the working class, are for the advantage of the community as a whole; and that to aim at such arrangements is to set up not an ignoble ideal, but the noblest that can be conceived.

Now one of the first things the working man is likely to find out, when he comes to consider how he shall use his political influence, is that big states and empires exist mainly for the advantage of big people. There are few well-to-do Englishmen who have not one or more relatives snugly provided for by posts which would disappear if we gave up the Imperial business. You yourself, Mr. Journalist, I strongly suspect, once drew an enormous salary in India, and are still quartered on the Indian Revenue. Every fresh annexation means new prizes and promotion for officials. The working class has nothing to do with all this.

Pride in the ever extending area of British territory, and the vast population subject to our rule, is a feeling confined to the well-to-do. It is a survival of military manners, and of the old belief that the material prosperity as well as the glory of any nation depended on its ability to bully its neighbours. The working class, inheriting not military but industrial manners and ideas does not share this sentiment. It has no thirst for war, conquest, or dominion. All its aspirations are peaceful, and therefore inconsistent with any political union which is not perfectly voluntary. "Imperial Democracy" has no existence except in the schemes and dreams of half-trained statesmen and half-crazy publicists.

Our superior friend, the West-End journalist, is beginning to have his misgivings. "Demos is henceforth our master. * * * How will Home Rule affect him? Has it anything to do with three acres and a cow? Is not the United Kingdom the work of the rich, and would not its dismemberment, perhaps, give the poor man his chance?

That is the way in which the poor blind giant is half inclined to consider the question." Yes, my superior friend, and very soon you will find him wholly inclined to consider it in that way. You can have no idea till you come to try it, how hard it will be to make him see what he gains by lending you his strength to hold India or Ireland. Your own case is clear enough. You know on which side your bread is buttered. Why should not he consider the question from the same point of view ?

The workman is quite right in his suspicion, that the bigness of our Empire is an obstacle to the improvement of his condition. He has only to look at the debates of the House of Commons from the beginning of the session to the end. He will find that when the members are not occupied with Ireland, they are busy with Egypt or Afghanistan or South Africa ; anything rather than the condition of English workmen. On wars in those distant lands, millions of money are squandered with hardly a show of opposition. But in a hard winter like that we have just passed through, when half our workmen are unemployed, Parliament has not a word to say or a penny to spare for them.

I will venture to quote here some words I wrote twenty years ago.

"The wealth, greatness, and glory of England have meant very little for the working man. Rather they have adjourned his emancipation. It is his interest—and it cannot be much longer concealed from him—that public attention should be concentrated on the state of England. The re-casting of our constitution, the redistribution of taxation, the substitution of a system of education for a state church, the limitation of proprietary rights in land, poor law reform, sanitary reform, legal reform, in a word the subordination of private interests to public utility—these are questions that cannot be dealt with even by public opinion while our energies and attention are wasted on the management of two hundred millions of people who do not belong to us. The direct, though not continuous, intervention of working men in the government of the country will be signalled by a refusal to let it be en-

cumbered any longer with this millstone of an empire. To the working man it is of little consequence whether the Union Jack flies at Gibraltar, Quebec, and Calcutta ; but of infinitely great importance that he have a fair share of the profits of production ; that the necessaries and comforts of life be within his reach ; that poison be not infused into the air he breathes and the water he drinks ; that rational education be provided for his children, and that his legitimate dignity be not wounded by institutions designed to consecrate and perpetuate social inequality. The present generation must make up its mind to see these questions raised, and the next, probably, to see them settled."

Since those words were written we have had two Reform Bills. The working classes do not yet swamp the other electors because they are handicapped by sly regulations about registration, hours of polling, and so on. But even now they weigh heavily, and the first result of their intervention is a movement for Home Rule, which is rapidly spreading from Ireland to England, Wales and Scotland. When we have Home Rule for England there will be some chance that workmen's questions will come to the front. Workmen and non-workmen will have to be brought face to face in comparatively small governmental areas if the former are to have anything like a fair chance of getting their interests attended to. Home Rule for Ireland is the first and most obviously practical step in this direction.

Mr. Chamberlain says he is against the Bill because the tendency of modern Europe is to unification rather than separation. It is a thousand pities that so able a man should be so imperfectly informed. A fuller acquaintance with facts and a sounder theory of history would have taught him the worthlessness of his crude and hasty generalisation. Religious wars in the 16th and 17th centuries, commercial wars in the 18th, revolutionary wars in the 19th, have, it is true, driven the peoples of Europe to suspend their abiding and normal predilection for Home Rule in obedience to the exigencies of attack and defence. But the ascendancy of industrial and pacific manners, now near at hand, will remove all induce-

ment for a degree of concentration which sacrifices the full and healthy development of political existence.

Even during the present century the tendency has not been upon the whole towards unification. Survey Europe from north to south. Russia has swallowed Finland and Poland, but she cannot digest them. Finland has her separate national institutions, and makes steady progress towards complete Home Rule. The Polish national spirit is inextinguishable, and must sooner or later prevail. Norway was conquered by the Swedish King in 1814; but, though the two countries remain under one sovereign, the smaller is completely independent of the larger. The Austrian Emperor, after conquering Hungary and destroying her independence in 1849, was obliged to restore it completely in 1867; and his motley dominions are now only held together by the concession of various degrees of Home Rule. Germany has been driven to unify—for military purposes only—by fear of France and Russia; Italy by fear of France and Austria. But that the unification will continue in either case when the danger shall have passed away I do not the least believe. Holland and Belgium were unified in 1815; but the latter regained its independence in 1830. The country we call Spain is still known to its own inhabitants as “the Spains”; and provincial feeling remains so strong that when the monarchy disappears it will very likely be succeeded by a Federal Republic.

Perhaps the argument most persistently brandished in the face of English sympathisers with the Irish demand for Home Rule is that it will lead, and is meant to lead, to separation. It may be remarked in passing that the same people who say this will tell you in the next breath that the bulk of the disaffected Irish really care for nothing but the Land question, and that Mr. Parnell would never have got them even to nibble at Home Rule if he had not baited it with Tenant Right. But the latter of these two conflicting lines of argument produces no effect on the English workman. It appeals to the small but powerful class of Englishmen who own land or hold mortgages in Ireland, or whose relations do; or

who, being English landlords, look on Irish landlords as an outpost of landlordism to be defended as long as possible. Our workmen have heard something of the Irish landlord, and there is no being so hateful to them. But they could hardly be expected to feel much enthusiasm for Home Rule if it really menaced the safety and welfare of their own country. Let us consider this bugbear.

There was a time, and it is not so far distant, when in the race for bigness, any weak country did run a risk of being snapped up, merely to add to the acreage and population of a powerful neighbour. I believe that many people are so unobservant as to imagine that this danger is as great as ever. Certainly, I have often heard the remark that if we dropped Ireland she would be annexed by France or America. One is almost ashamed to undertake a serious refutation of so ludicrous a delusion. Ninety years ago the French government of that day did plan a conquest of Ireland; and many Irishmen at that time would have welcomed it. But even then Bonaparte pooh-poohed the scheme, pointing out to the Directory that Ireland was much more embarrassing to England as she was than if she were a French province. At the present time it may be safely said, that there is not a single Irishman or a single Frenchman who would listen to such a proposal with patience. That many, perhaps most Irishmen, would gladly join the United States, I quite believe. But nothing is more certain than that if Mr. Parnell went down on his knees for it, and Mr. Gladstone joined in his entreaties, the United States would not accept Ireland at any price. It has been a wise rule of their policy from the first, to annex no trans-marine territory, and Ireland is certainly the last country for which they would break it.

I have thought it well to notice this absurd delusion, because I know that it prevails widely among ill-informed people. No statesman would think of countenancing it, except perhaps Lord Randolph Churchill, if he found himself addressing a peculiarly ignorant audience, where there happened to be no reporters. Need I stop to examine the fearful probability that four millions and three-quarters of

Irishmen would attempt an invasion of the thirty-two millions who inhabit this island? There are people, I know, who measure the distance from Kingstown to Holyhead, or worse still from the coast of Antrim to the Mull of Cantire, and shake their heads. But there are some things one cannot argue about with gravity.

The military disadvantages of Home Rule or separation usually dwelt upon, are of quite another kind. It is said we had better hold Ireland fast while we have got her, because it would be a difficult matter to re-conquer her. Certainly it would. And glad I am to think it. To chastise her if she deserved it would be easy enough. But if she were separated from us to-morrow, for any reason or by any means, there would not in twelve months time be a single public man in England who would desire to re-conquer her. Whatever shape chastisement might take, it would not be that. Don't tell me that we should go back to collect taxes or rents, or to take the part of an oppressed Ulster. When once John Bull has tasted the blessing of freedom from the Irish yoke, nothing will induce him to run his neck into it again.

As for the ancient parties, the certainty that they will have to get along together somehow, and settle their differences without the intervention of Lord Randolph Churchill, is the one thing needed to make them drop their weapons. Material interests will assert themselves. It is not the well-to-do people who have anything to fear. They will manage in the long run to hold their own in Ireland, as they have done everywhere else from the beginning of history; and, for the matter of that, considerably more than their own. At present they are heavily weighted by our impotent championship. When the curtain rises, and self-governing Ireland is discovered entering on her new career, it will be found that parties have sorted themselves with amazing promptitude, and after a quite unexpected fashion. The sight of Mr. Parnell and Mr. Healy with Down and Antrim at their back, rallying the party of order, restoring confidence, re-enlisting the old constabulary, suppressing moonlighters, passing an alien act for the benefit of Mr. O'Donovan Rossa, and haggling

with Messrs. Rothschild about the price of issue of a 4 per cent. loan, will make people over here rub their eyes. The landlords who, unwisely relying on Opera-house unanimity, and the political acumen of Professor Tyndall and the Poet Laureate, allowed the sand to run out of Mr. Gladstone's hour-glass, will cling to the uncrowned king, and console themselves with the reflection that he is the owner of acres in Wicklow, and has granite quarries to develope. History has yet to furnish an example of any community failing to organise adequate protection for life and property, when foreign complications are not present.

And now observe. When once we have realised that union with Ireland is not so valuable to us as to be worth any considerable sacrifice, from that moment it becomes possible to establish it on a solid and permanent basis. For the truth is that Ireland has vastly more to gain by union than we have. Oddly enough this important truth is being constantly asserted by English politicians who yet have not the good sense and courage to act upon it. It is a truth which hitherto has been somewhat obscured from the perception of the Irish, because they have never yet had occasion to give it a thought. But it must certainly have afforded matter for serious reflection within the last few weeks to those able and distinguished Irishmen who are likely soon to be responsible for the government of their country.

What it comes to is this. The Irish are at present masters of the situation, because we are afraid of separation and they are not, or rather think they are not. But the moment we make up our minds that it will be better for us to separate than to be governed by Ireland—which is virtually our fate now—we are in a position to offer them independence on either the colonial or federal model, subject to all such conditions as we can reasonably desire to impose. At present, Mr. Gladstone is challenged to prove that the guarantees he has devised will be of any avail against the bad faith or ill will of the Irish people. It must be confessed that there are only two possible guarantees

which can be worth anything: either a readiness on our part to reconquer Ireland, or a readiness to cast her off; and of these, the latter has the advantage in respect of justice, cheapness, ease, rapidity, and, in my opinion, efficacy.

How humiliating is the position now of an English minister in negotiation with Mr. Parnell. The latter, as in duty bound, resents every guarantee as an indignity, haggles over every penny of money, treats every restriction as a rag of the old tyranny, and after all—reasonably enough—points out his inability to pledge his successors to be satisfied with the concessions made now. The minister cannot threaten coercion, for the weapon has broken in his hand, and no coercion is of any use unless it is carried to a point which public opinion here is not prepared to tolerate. What a novel and inspiriting sensation of strength would he experience if he could meet every unreasonable demand or unfulfilled obligation with the threat, not of doing something, but of ceasing to do something. Get us into no scrapes with foreign powers or we dissolve partnership; pay up your Federal contribution, or we cut you adrift; vote additional supplies for this war and call out your militia, as we are doing, or we shall leave you to make the best terms you can with the enemy; boycott our goods, and we shall boycott yours. What refreshing language this would be!

As long as our demands were reasonable and fair in themselves, enlightened self-interest would ensure their acceptance. Just consider what disruption of the Union would then mean for Ireland. Where could she raise a loan except in England? Where could she send her produce except to England? Where could an Irish joint stock company be floated except in London? Irishmen in our army or navy or civil service, Irish clergymen, doctors and lawyers residing in England, would they like to be called on to opt between English and Irish nationality? How would Irishmen get on abroad without the protection of English ambassadors and consuls? Would they, the poorest nation in Europe, like to go to the expense of setting up a separate army, navy, and diplo-

matic service? If Ireland undervalues these advantages now, it is because she has to set against them the denial of Home Rule. Concede Home Rule, and they become clear boons, not to be lightly thrown away or trifled with.

Mr. Gladstone has told us plainly that he has introduced the so-called guarantees into his Bill only as a concession to jealousies which he did not share, and regarded as a weakness. I have no doubt he sees clearly what I have endeavoured to point out, that in the well-proved absence of a determination on the part of the English people to trample out Irish patriotism by brute force, there is only one guarantee for the maintenance of the Union which is of any efficacy; and that is a readiness to throw up the Union. "He that loveth his life shall lose it, but he that hateth it shall keep it unto life eternal." Let Mr. Gladstone plant a firm foot on reality. Let him drop these idle and irritating precautions. He will not only conciliate the Irish, but he will pull the lynchpin out of the whole argument of such a critic as Mr. Justice Stephen. As long as he admits that the Union is something never to be surrendered he puts the long arm of the lever into the hand of Mr. Parnell, and furnishes the Imperialists with an opportunity of scoring a petty triumph in the conflict of words.

I have not pretended to deal in these few pages with all the subordinate issues that have arisen in the Home Rule controversy. It was the less necessary to do so because I have gone straight to the root of the matter. If I have seemed to argue the question chiefly from the point of view of English interests, I trust no one will suspect me of placing these above English duties. I am addressing myself principally to our working men, and I know that after all nothing moves them so much as an appeal to their sense of justice and moral right. They do not need to be reminded of the cruel wrongs our country has inflicted on Ireland, wrongs which we only began to redress seventeen years ago. I believe they will think that it is not enough to redress these wrongs, but that some reparation for them is due. While I would not pay a penny to Ireland by way of blackmail, or as a bribe to induce her

to accept a settlement which does not and ought not to satisfy her, I would cheerfully make her a parting gift of the fifty millions which the landlords have spurned, to be expended on public works, as some compensation for the poverty in which English rule has sunk her. I believe our workmen would give it for such a purpose with an open heart, though they naturally grudge it to the landlords.

I cannot conclude these remarks without testifying my admiration for the sagacity and pluck which Mr. Gladstone has displayed in this crowning achievement of his career. I may call it so, though the immediate issue is still uncertain. For nothing can now undo the work of the last month, even should its author not live to witness its final success.

It has been a magnificent stand that the old general has made, let it end for the moment how it will. I must confess I did not think he had it in him. Superhuman efforts were made to impress the public with the idea that the proposal was a huge joke, that it was scouted by the whole nation, that Mr. Gladstone stood absolutely alone, that he was a lunatic or worse. Such a torrent of unscrupulous malignity has never burst on the head of any statesman in our time. The calculation was that the unparalleled violence of this concerted onslaught would prevent the Home Rule Bill from passing its first reading, that is to say, would inflict on Mr. Gladstone, not merely a defeat, but an insult; his influence would be shattered, and the prestige which long success had given him would be at an end.

Well, this desperate attempt to suppress the Bill before it had even been seen, and to drive its author from public life just as you would bundle a drunken man out of an orderly assembly, has failed. It was the only chance of neutralising the prodigious impulse given to Home Rule by his conversion, and it has failed. The Bill is before the country, and every day shows more clearly that the mass of the Liberal party is prepared to support it. But whether it passes in the present form or not is of quite

secondary importance. The essential point gained is that Home Rule is irrevocably inscribed on the programme of the Liberal party, and we know that what is once set down there is bound to come sooner or later.

In the face of this remarkable and rapid adhesion of Liberals throughout the country, where is the reasonableness of Mr. Bright's complaint that more time should have been allowed for ventilating the question? Translated into plain English, this means that Members of Parliament, especially some of the more prominent of them, having regard to many foolish and often insincere utterances when they were on the stump last autumn, would have preferred to make their conversion appear more gradual and spontaneous. It is not consistent with their dignity, forsooth, to face about so rapidly. It lends countenance to the monstrous calumny that a Member of Parliament sometimes changes his opinions in obedience to pressure from his constituents. But time pressed, and Mr. Gladstone felt that he had more important things to consider than how he should help honourable gentlemen to lift the other leg over the fence in a dignified and graceful way. He judged that the adhesion of his party would be secured more speedily and effectually by going straight to the people, and his judgment has proved correct.

It is idle to raise the cry of despotism and dictation. Mr. Gladstone reigns indeed; but it is in the hearts of the people. They are learning that if they want their business done, they must find a man they can trust, and depute him to do it. Parliaments—yes, and cabinets—are honeycombed with personal intrigues and ignoble jealousies. What a sorry spectacle it has been! But the self-seekers have received a rude lesson. They never imagined that Mr. Gladstone, who had always shown a genuine veneration for rank, and a deplorable backwardness to make full use of his unparalleled influence, would at last put forth his strength. When Whig peers pouted, a stonemason was called in—a memorable warning to Whig peers. To help him in shaping the bill, Mr. Gladstone wisely summoned to his side, not the proprietors of rival

schemes, but the man who of all others had done most to prepare the public mind and to educate it out of its prejudices. The courage and staunchness of Mr. Morley will never be forgotten. He has already won for himself a large measure of the trust and attachment that have been the strength of the veteran leader.

I remember when the liberation of Italy and the abolition of slavery in the United States seemed distant and even improbable. That I should have been privileged to see two such glorious triumphs of justice and humanity in my time was more than my share of good fortune. And now I have lived to see the dawn of another glad day, rich in its promise of a future, happier for Ireland, nobler for England. Nay, it is no mere promise for the future. We are to-day better men and happier men, those of us who are putting our hands to this sacred work, because the uneasy load of national wrong-doing is already lifted from our consciences. Not ours any more the guilt if we are doing our best, each of us according to his means and opportunities, to wipe it away. Nothing can give peace of mind in political action but a firm resolve never to recognise as politically right what is morally wrong. Those who know that peace must from their hearts wish it to all their countrymen.

May 8, 1886.

The Irish Question.

FACTS FOR MR. PARNELL'S BILL.

A Speech

Delivered in the House of Commons, on 21st September, 1886,

BY

JOHN DILLON, M.P.

LONDON:

THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1886

Price One Penny.

R. D. Webb and Son, Printers,
74 Abbey-street, Dublin.

FACTS FOR MR. PARNELL'S BILL.

I THINK it is hardly fair or generous of the right hon. gentleman, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, to charge the Irish party with taking no interest in this bill, because they have not addressed the House to-night. I myself, representing the party, was anxious to take part in the debate during the course of the evening; but, availing myself of the ordinary channels of information, I understood the right hon. gentleman intended to speak at 9.30 o'clock, and was accordingly prevented from rising to address the House at that hour, as I intended to do. The Government might easily know, if they had any true information from Ireland, we do take an interest in this bill, and we could not fail to take an interest in it, dealing as it does with the great cause of the Irish tenantry, whom we represent in this House (Irish cheers). I have listened to the tone of menace and defiance which characterizes the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland with a great deal of regret, but without the least alarm (cheers)—with a great deal of regret, because in introducing this bill, as the Government might at least do us the justice to believe, our hope was to procure an interval of peace in Ireland during which we might lay before the people of England the cause, in the justice of which we believe—it is not because I fear the landlord party of Ireland if this bill is defeated, but I look forward with the greatest sorrow to the struggle which must inevitably ensue (cheers). That is the reason I listened to the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland with the deepest possible regret. No one believes that the Irish landlords will profit by this new act of folly on their part. Knowing how they suffered for the rejection of the

Disturbance Bill, I have the most perfect confidence that they will suffer in like manner for the rejection of this bill (cheers). In the speeches of the many hon. members who dealt with this subject there was, as it seemed to me, a sad want of appreciation of the gravity of the situation in Ireland (cheers). We were met with quibbling arguments, with figures which I can hardly think that the men who quoted them believed to be correct; but all through this debate—and I call the attention of hon. members to this fact—of the members representing constituencies in the north of Ireland—members representing the landlord and Conservative party in Ireland—not a single one has spoken (cheers).

It is a strange thing—an anomalous thing—that when this motion was brought forward for the rejection of a bill affecting the tenant-farmers of Ireland, and affecting directly no other class, that that motion was made by a member who represents the borough of Cambridge, and seconded by a member who represents the city of Londonderry (cheers), and that the hon. members—and there is a fair number of them in this House—who are landlords themselves, and who represent Irish constituencies, have not opened their mouths against this bill (cheers). That is, I say, an anomalous and important fact, and I believe that the true reason that underlies this is that, while they would go into the lobby against this bill, they know, because they live in Ireland and have estates there, that the results in Ireland which will follow from the rejection of this bill, will be results of enormous interest and enormous danger to all who have landed estates in Ireland (cheers), and they know whatever mock heroics may be indulged in by English Catholic snobs (loud cheers), or by London solicitors, who have no real connection with Ireland, that the circumstances in which we are placed are circumstances of the utmost gravity; and they prefer to give a silent vote (cheers). I listened to the speech of the hon. member for South Tyrone (laughter), a gentleman who seems on this occasion to have added one more to the many wreaths of laurel which he has already won in the House, for performing the feat of standing on

two stools (cheers). That hon. member represents the Tory landlords of South Tyrone, who sent him into this House, and he serves his masters well ; but I beg leave to state that the tune which we hear him sing here is a very different one from that which he sings on platforms before the tenant-farmers of South Tyrone (cheers) ; for I have it from a gentleman in whose veracity I have the most perfect confidence, that he listened to the hon. member addressing meetings of his constituents at the last election, and that speaking to the tenant-farmers whom he was then trying to wheedle into voting for him, he used these words :—

“The judicial rents cannot be paid ; and what is more they ought not to be paid.”

(Home Rule cheers). That is the language which does for the County Tyrone farmer. And the language we have heard to-night is the language which suits the House of Commons (Home Rule cheers).

I wish to say a word or two in answer to criticisms as to the way in which this bill would work. It has been stated that it would probably take months and years to work this act ; and when I hear that it makes me strongly suspect that hon. members have not studied this bill, or the working of similar acts. One argument was this--while it was admitted that 135,000 cases were settled within eight or nine months under the Arrears Act, it was said that these were cases in which the landlord and the tenant had made joint applications, and, therefore, there was no need to investigate whether the tenant could or could not pay. If that were so, then the landlord, and the tenant, and the Court, entered into a combination to defraud the British Treasury ; for the Act said that the court “shall inquire” whether the tenant is able to pay, and if it is assumed that the court made no inquiry, then it is suggested that there was a tripartite confederacy to defraud the public revenue. If that be so, all I can say is that the Solicitor-General for Ireland has a very low opinion of the morality of Irish lawyers.

MR. GIBSON.—I made no such imputation.

MR. DILLON.—I never said he did (hear, hear, and cheers). I said the imputation was implied in his argument, and if he denies the imputation then he asserts that the courts did honestly investigate the cases—that this very court to which we propose to refer the working of the bill, did in six months deal with 135,000 cases, and finished them all (hear and cheers). Is there I would ask, any likelihood of anything like so many cases coming under the operation of this bill? (hear, hear). I will later on draw attention to the figures which have been used by hon. members opposite; but I now express my belief that the vast majority of the Irish landlords, seeing what is before them if this bill were passed, would make settlements with their tenants without going into court at all, and that out of the 200,000 or 300,000 tenants who would come under the operation of the bill, three-fourths or four-fifths would come to a settlement of that sort. My estimate is that if this bill were passed, not 20,000 cases would come before the Irish Land Court, and with the experience of the present staff of the court, I have perfect confidence that it would dispose of every single case in six months.

I want to say a word about the number of tenants to whom this bill would apply, and the number who would be left out. We tried to make the bill as moderate as we thought was consistent with the interests of the public peace; and now it is made a charge against us that we have not included the tenants whose rents were fixed in 1885. I don't think it was fair to stop at December 31st, 1884. But why did we do it? Because we wanted to bring forward a bill as slightly subject to hostile criticism in the House of Commons as possible. It would have been argued, if we had gone to December 31st, 1885, that we were including in our bill the very tenants whose rents had been settled after the fall in prices. The Solicitor-General stated that the bill would exclude 70,000 tenants, whose rents were fixed in 1885. Now the tenants whose rents were fixed up to December 31st, 1884, number 153,465. The tenants whose rents were fixed

during the year 1885 number 21,900; and the tenants whose rents have been fixed during the present year are 19,500. These we don't claim. But hon. members are quite welcome to put the 1885 tenants in the bill if they like (cheers). I believe that of these 153,000 to which the bill would bring relief, not 20,000 would come before the court. I believe that as soon as the Irish landlords saw how things were going in the court a general settlement would then take place all over Ireland. There is no earthly reason why the Land Courts should not dispose of these cases with the utmost celerity. The operation of going over the land and valuing it has been done. There is no occasion to repeat it; and the records are in the possession of the court and can easily be got at.

The two main arguments on which we have rested our case for the necessity of this bill are these:—First of all the totally unlooked for and unexpected fall in agricultural prices which has taken place this year—coming on the top of another depression, through which every one in Ireland supposed that we had nearly passed—and the calamitous character of the season for the last month in Ireland over the south and west which is more serious than has been supposed. The second strong point in our argument is what we consider to be the probable action of the landlords during the coming winter.

The question of the fall in prices has been so fully dealt with, that I do not propose to take up the time of the House any further with this subject. But there are two or three points connected with it—and even at this late hour I must ask the indulgence of the House while I direct attention to them, for they are exceedingly important. First, I wish to refer to the stale old argument, which has done so much service against us, and injured us so much in England—that Griffith's Valuation of Ireland was made at a time of great depression and of low prices, and that in order to appreciate on what basis that valuation was made, we must go back to the schedule of prices contained in the Valuation Act, and to the conditions which prevailed in Irish agriculture in

1852. Now, once for all, I utterly deny this proposition. And to make good my denial I must read to the House a few extracts from the evidence taken by an important Committee of this House, which was appointed in 1869 to enquire into the question of the valuation of Ireland. Before that Committee were examined Sir Richard Griffith, and most of the officers who had worked under him on the valuation of Ireland, besides other important witnesses. And these extracts I shall read, with a view of proving three propositions, each of them of the utmost importance.

First—That in the opinion of Sir Richard Griffith himself, his valuation of Ulster was up to the full letting value in that province in 1869, the time when this evidence was given. I think every hon. member will admit the importance of that statement, when I say that it takes into account all the tenant's improvements, which in Ulster in 1869, I believe, were more than one-half of the entire value of the property.

Secondly—That from 15 to 20 per cent. added to the valuation of three southern provinces would bring them up to the same standard as Ulster: and

Thirdly—That in this valuation all the tenant's improvements—building, and draining, and fencing—were fully included. The valuers on the farms valued as they found them, and made no allowance whatever for the improvements made by the tenants.

In Question 1574, Sir R. Griffith was asked:—

“ Do you think that if the three southern provinces are valued on the scale of agricultural prices during the five years preceding 1866, it would be a uniform valuation with the valuation of Ulster—that is made on a different scale? ”

Sir R. Griffith answers:—

“ The fact is, the improvement in agriculture was so great that the valuers took a very high view of it. It has been shown by a member of the Committee that our valuation was perhaps on a scale too high, for it is equal to the rents. I know that in an estate of my own in the County of Londonderry my valuation was higher than the rents.”

And again :—

Question 1576 :—"It [The valuation of Ulster] must have been either upon the scale or not?" Answer :—"We did attend to the scale; it was a certain guide; but I think the full value of the improvements was taken into consideration, and in consequence of that we came up to the letting rents of the principal landlords."

And hon. members must recollect that this valuation of Ulster was made after the enormous rise in prices caused by the Crimean war.

Now I come to the evidence of Mr. John E. Vernon, who ought to be an authority with Conservative gentlemen in this House, as he has been one of the largest land agents in Ireland—a Conservative himself—and was appointed as the Conservative member of the Irish Land Commission. Mr. Vernon was asked :—

Question 3032 :—"Is it the fact that the higher valuation of Ulster arises from the new valuation having just been completed in that province?" Answer :—"I believe that to be the fact."

Question 3033 :—"And that will account for the difference of the valuation in Ulster and in other provinces in Ireland?" Answer :—"Quite so."

Thus showing unmistakeably, that in the opinion of Mr. Vernon the valuation was not carried out on the basis of prices in schedule to the Act, but in accordance with the conditions of agriculture at time of valuation, which time was subsequent to the Crimean war.

Now with reference to the southern provinces. Mr. John Ball Greene was asked :—

Question 2415 :—"You say there is a difference between the North and South, of 15 per cent.?" Answer :—"I am sure there is."

Question 2416 :—"Is not the difference still larger?" Answer :—"In some cases it may be as high as 20 per cent."

Now, Sir, with regard to the question of the improvements of the tenants, I must ask permission to read a few more extracts. Mr. Green, who was second in command at the Valuation Office under Sir R. Griffith, was asked :—

Question 425 :—"In making these deductions (in respect of taxes) from the valuation, did you ever take into account the existence of tenant-right in the north of Ireland ?" Answer :—"No."

Question 426 :—"That is not an element in your calculation at all ?" Answer :—"None."

Now Mr. Vernon on the same subject :—

Question 3029 :—"As far as you know, they value on what may be called the intrinsic value of the land, without reference to the various interests which may have grown up by the use or letting of the land ?" Answer :—"I believe that to be the case."

Question 3030 :—"Therefore, they have no occasion to consider the question of what is called tenant-right ?" Answer :—"I do not believe that they consider it. I believe that they value the land as they see it and find it."

I assert, and every Irish tenant in Ulster will bear me out, and I defy even the hon. member for North Tyrone to deny it, that in Ulster in 1869, and when the valuation was completed, the value of the province was more than half made up of the unrewarded labour of the tenantry (cheers). The improvements, the drains, the fences, and the buildings, were all made by them ; and thousands, aye, hundreds of thousands, of acres of worthless bog and waste mountain were brought into cultivation by their untiring industry. And all this was done almost universally, without the slightest assistance from the landlord.

And when this valuation of Ulster was made, what a state of things did it bring to light ? That the whole of this vast property—the creation of the tenant farmers of Ulster, had by a gradual process of rent raising, been confiscated by their landlords. For we are told that the valuers valued the lands as they found them ; and the result came out about equal to the rents. And this, too—although, as I have proved, the valuation was made at a time of great agricultural prosperity. We of the National party have often been denounced as robbers by Irish landlords. But here is a case of wholesale confiscation by Irish landlords, which for injustice and cruelty it would be

hard to parallel in history. So much for Griffith's valuation. But the whole subject is one which would repay careful study.

Now, Sir, I think it has been clearly proved in the course of this debate, that the fall in prices during the last year is on an average, nearly, if not quite, 20 per cent. But are we to believe that the Land Commissioners in fixing rents, looked only to the value of the bad years, 1881, 1882, and 1883? I have it on the authority of more than one of the Commissioners themselves, that they were guided by an average—going back to the year 1877—believing, as they did, that the depression existing at the time was only temporary, and that in order to do justice they should consider the high prices of 1877 to 1879, as well as the low prices of succeeding years. Suppose, then, for the sake of illustration, that we admit that present prices show a fall of 25 per cent., as compared with those which the Commissioners had in view when fixing rents previous to last Autumn. What reduction in his rent would a tenant be entitled to, in view of a 25 per cent. fall in prices? This is a question which has not been sufficiently brought before the House.

Sir Richard Griffith, who was no friend to the Irish tenants, in his instructions to his valuators, said—"One hundred acres of tillage produces £592, and the cost of production is £359." Therefore, the amount to be divided between landlord and tenant is £235, and that is considerably less than 50 per cent. of the total produce. But will anybody deny that in Ireland there has been absolutely no fall in the cost of production—not one shilling to the unfortunate tenant—therefore, the whole loss falls on the net profit. Now, according to the calculation of Sir Richard Griffith, the net profit is considerably under 50 per cent. of the gross produce on a tillage farm. Therefore, in view of a fall in prices of 25 per cent.—if we accept the principle of dividing the loss equally between landlord and tenant—the tenant would be entitled to a reduction of considerably over 25 per cent.. And when the system of rack-renting prevails, as it largely does in Ireland—it would be manifestly unjust to divide this loss equally between landlord and tenant.

Now, in support of our contention, that a strong case exists for at least a temporary reduction of rents fixed in 1881-'82-'83—let me quote a most remarkable case reported at page 13, *Return of Judicial Rents* for May and June last.

In 1881 the tenant got his rent reduced, presumably by private agreement with his landlord, from £180 to £150, and having applied to the Land Court in this year his rent was further reduced to £112—that is, a reduction of 24 per cent. on the rent fixed in 1881.

I wish to direct attention to a few evidences of depression, which have not been noticed in this debate. In the month of November last, the Central Antrim Tenants' Defence Association—a purely Protestant association, which worked against us at the general election—passed a resolution to the effect that 50 per cent. won't meet the depression of prices; that the depression is so great that if it continues it will be quite impossible for the tenants in Ulster to pay rent and live (hear, hear). Further, this association says that the tenant-right of Ulster farms is unsaleable, except in choice and exceptional farms (hear, hear). We have heard a volley of assertions from the hon. member for Derry (Mr. Lewis) as to the enormous prices given for Ulster tenant rights. All I can say is, that I am perfectly content to place against the authority of that gentleman, the authority of the Central Antrim Tenants' Defence Association (cheers). That is not all. I turn to still more remarkable testimony of the present depression, and of the deplorable state in which farmers are. At a recent meeting of the Kildare Board of Guardians, the clerk brought forward a letter from another Board of Guardians, calling attention to the sufferings of the farmers; and a resolution was proposed, setting forth that the interests of the landlords, as well as the tenants, would be best promoted by the making of substantial abatements, and that 50 per cent. off the Government valuation is the least that can do any good. The Baron de Robeck, both a landlord and a tenant-farmer, said:—

"I agree with everything Mr. Fenton has said, except regarding the per-cent-age of reduction. I would agree to that too in a certain way ; but I agree with Mr. Fenton as to the depreciation in prices. I am sorry to say that the bad weather for this season has altogether spoiled the crop. I would agree to everything he said, except to draw a hard and fast line at fifty per cent., as what one man might want might be too much for another. It may be necessary in some cases, but it is not necessary in all."

Here is a well known Conservative landlord, who stood in the Conservative interest for the County of Kildare at the last election, and his declaration at the Kildare Board of Guardians is, that this reduction may be necessary in some cases, but not in all. He agreed finally in the resolution, the proposer having agreed to omit the figure, 50 per cent. Other landlords followed. Major Burrowes, deputy-lieutenant of the county, and a large land owner, supported the resolution. Mr. Mansfield, an *ex-officio*-guardian, a large land owner in the county, supported the resolution. And what was the resolution ? It was a resolution calling on the Government to put a stop to capricious evictions (cheers) ; and this resolution was passed at a meeting of the Board of Guardians, with a tenant farmer in the chair, and it was supported by the late Conservative candidate, and other Conservative land owners supported him. Not a single voice, except the voices of two individuals in the whole meeting, was raised against it ; and these gentlemen did not object to the resolution, but they said it was not proper business of the board. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, if this is not evidence to impress on the House the necessity of something being done. Where are we to go for evidence ? If you won't believe Irish Nationalists, if you won't believe Presbyterian farmers, will you believe Conservative landlords in the County of Kildare ? (cheers). It is utterly impossible to answer or contradict any of these facts.

There was only one point in the speech of the hon. member for the borough of Derry which I deemed to be the least worthy of consideration. It is perfectly true, as pointed out by the late

Chancellor of the Exchequer, the right hon. gentleman the member for Derby (Sir W. Harcourt), that all the speeches from the Ministerial side were addressed to showing that there was no urgent case for the reduction of rent in Ireland. The only strong point in the speech of the hon. member for Derry, had relation to what he made out to be the increasing wealth of the Irish farmers in live stock and cattle. I have noticed in this debate a most extraordinary perversion of figures. I do not say it was a deliberate perversion, but I believe the figures were supplied by agencies; and hon. members who made use of them did not look into them for themselves. What did the hon member for Derry say? He said there was an increase of all kinds of stock in Ireland, with the solitary exception of pigs. Will hon. members listen to the true facts of the case? From 1885 to 1886 these are the figures. In horses there is an increase of 2,013; and this entirely took place in two-year-olds; and we attribute this to the fact, that farmers having found the rearing of cattle entirely unprofitable, turned to try their hand at horses. There was a decrease of 912 in one-year-olds, which showed that the experiment did not answer their expectations. Another item which created some laughter was that of asses. The small farmers do their carting with asses, and there is a decrease of 912. The hon. member quoted the figures in cattle, and he led the House to believe that there was an increase of wealth in Ireland in cattle. This year the net decrease in cattle is 44,824; and that only very slightly brings before the House the real facts, which are alarming and appalling in the extremest degree. There was an increase of milch cows of 1,300, a slight increase of three-year-olds—3,502—and why? Because the Irish farmers could not sell them, and they took them home because they could get no price for them (cheers). This is a thing to which I would beg the attention of the hon. members. In two-year-olds there was a decrease of 48,936, and why? Because the Irish farmers killed their calves because they found they could not pay for their rearing. The reason of that appalling decrease is the reason I tell you—the farmers were so dispirited

and broken-hearted by the prices they were offered for store cattle that they killed the calves (cheers).

Now, these figures utterly contradict the statements of the hon. member for Derry, and reveal a condition of things, which to those who are acquainted with the real life of the Irish farmers, about which the member for Derry knows nothing, is simply appalling. The hon. member for Derry pointed out that the people of Ireland had increased the amount of land in cultivation. He pointed to the fact that there was an increase in the land under tillage of 76,000 acres ; of this, 59,000, I find, is meadow and clover. The increase in real tillage is only 17,000 acres ; and of that 15,000 is in flax in Ulster, and 2,000 in potatoes. In oats, which we are told by the hon. members opposite is the really paying crop, there has been a decrease of 5,664 acres. That looks, does it not, as if the wealth of the Irish farmers was increasing? I allude to the figures of the hon. member for Derry, because they certainly surprised myself. I did not know how to account for them, and I had these figures made out to-day and carefully checked.

It has been said that the Land Commissioners who settled the rents were friends of the tenants. That was a most audacious assertion (cheers). Why, Sir, hundreds and thousands of tenants I know in Ireland have refused to go into the Land Courts, because the Land Commissioners were mainly and largely in the landlords' interest. I have a return which answers this assertion completely. Out of thirty-three lay Commissioners appointed under the Land Act, seventeen were landlords or agents—50 per cent. of the members of the Land Court were landlords or agents. I do not know that anyone will venture after that to say that they were in the tenants' interest ? (cheers).

What is it we ask that you should do by this bill in this House? Simply make Irish landlords do what English landlords do—nay, to make Irish landlords do a great deal less than what English landlords always have done, or generally have done. If Irish landlords had acted reasonably in the past, there

would have been no necessity for any of the acts dealing with the Irish land question, that have been passed in this House. It is useless for anyone to come forward and talk of Irish landlords having been tried and found not guilty. If they were found not guilty, then why did this House spend weeks and months passing the Compensation for Disturbance Bill and the various Irish Land Bills ? The second branch of our argument relates to the conduct of the Irish landlords. I admit that if it could be shown that they could be expected to act as reasonable men in the face of this crisis, there would be no necessity for this bill. But what is the fact ? Past experience has shown that they cannot be trusted (Irish cheers). It is impossible for me to go into the whole of our cases ; but I must ask the House to have patience while I refer to the recent actions of some leading landlords, in showing that they cannot be expected to act reasonably, and that if you refuse us this bill you will drive the Executive Government in Ireland into courses which the moral sense of England will condemn (hear, hear). We have heard a good deal of Lord Clanricarde. He never goes near his estate, and his tenants never see him. His tenants came into court in the month of May this year. If you ask me why they did not come there before, I will answer that they were afraid to do so ; because, as in the case of so many other estates, the tenant has hanging gales, and the threat of costs of appeals held over his head, and is warned that every penny will be taken out of him by writs from the Superior Courts in Dublin, if he dares to go into the Land Court. Well ; his tenants at last came into court, and numbers got their rents fixed last May and June, and here are some of the reductions :—

Old Rent.	Judicial Rent.
£30 0 0	£15 0 0
10 0 0	7 0 0
11 0 0	7 15 0
18 16 0	11 10 0
30 0 0	14 15 0
6 10 0	3 15 0
15 0 0	9 10 0

These, I admit, are picked cases. But the reductions averaged over 25 per cent. And now, Sir, let us consider for a moment what Clanricarde's action has been in the past, and what he is doing at this moment. And remember, this is a man who has, I suppose, two or three thousand tenants in the County Galway. After the election at which my hon. and gallant friend, the member for North Galway, was elected in 1872, Lord Clanricarde raised his rents, to punish his tenants for voting against his nominee. So far as I can learn, Lord Clanricarde has never spent anything on his estate, nor in any way shown an interest in the welfare of his tenants. And his estate in Galway is now a centre of disturbance.

Let me quote a few cases from a statement I have received, of what has recently taken place at Woodford, on this property. The tenants having asked a reduction of 25 per cent., Lord Clanricarde refused any concession. A number of tenants were picked out and proceeded against by writs from the Superior Court in Dublin, instead of the ordinary county court civil bill. This was done, of course, with a view to increase the cost enormously, and to terrify the rest of the tenantry. I now proceed to quote some cases from the statement :—

“ 1. Pat Conroy, aged 76, wife aged 75, four children, owed one and a-half year's rent, £36; but on 7th June last paid a half year's rent, for which he has acknowledgment written on the back of his last receipt, and was *then assured no further proceedings* would be taken. Costs, £17 10s.

“ 2. Pat Fahy, wife and child, three brothers and sister, owed two years' rent, £25. Costs, £18.

“ 3. James Bruder, aged 70, wife and three children, owed one and a-half years' rent, £18. Costs, £17 10s.

“ 4. Thomas Saunders, wife, old mother, and seven children, owed two years' rent, £18. Costs, £17 10s.

In amounts stated to be due in these cases is included the hanging gale ; and the injustice of adding this is especially great on the Clanricarde property, as on that estate it has always been the custom to pay annually in October the rent which fell

due the November previous. Conroy, Fahy, and Bruder, and their ancestors for generations (and this applies generally on the estate), worked on their holdings, built houses, made drains, walls, fences, etc., in fact brought their holdings to their present state, without the slightest assistance in money or materials from the landlord. And though the rents are lower than on Mr. Lewis' property in this parish, were the tenants' rights to their improvements respected, the rents should be enormously cut down. Even as the Land Act is worked, at the late Portumna Land Sessions, the reductions on the Clanricarde estate ranged from 30 to 50 per cent. Saunders—the fourth case mentioned above—came into possession on payment of £100 fine about seventeen years ago. He had just come from Australia, where by farming he had made over £600; he built a house and offices at an expense of about £200; and although strictly sober, hard-working, and industrious, he is now not worth a shilling. To evict these four men, the bailiff came with 700 police and a gang of Orange emergency men from Ulster. All the tenants on this property were and are willing (so far as they are able, for some of them are too poor) to pay their rents on a reduction of 5s. in the pound. And whilst Lord Clanricarde is said to have granted 7s. 6d. in the pound to his English tenants, he refuses a farthing to his tenants here! And this is one of the men on whose forbearance the government wish us to rely. And to support this mean, cruel, and stupid tyranny, the Irish government will be compelled, during the coming winter, to use the forces of the crown.

It is plainly impossible for me to go into the details of many other cases. I must content myself with giving some samples of reductions which have been made on the estates of some of these gentlemen in whose moderation and forbearance we are asked to trust. Take the estate of Martin McDonnell of County Galway:—

Old Rent.	Judicial Rent
£2 3 9	£0 17 6
2 6 5	1 2 6
2 0 0	0 17 0

And so on. The reductions averaged over 60 per cent.

These are all cases in which in my opinion there ought to be no rent at all, for the tenants are men who were evicted from their former holdings and left naked and bare on the mountain side, and rent is put upon the land which they reclaimed, and the mud huts which they built (Parnellite cheers).

Let us come to Mr. Loftus Tottenham (hear hear). His tenants entered the Land Court, having at last mustered up courage, in the month of April last, and the general reductions average very close upon 50 per cent. This is one of the gentlemen who would get up in this House and defend the Irish landlords. Rents of £5 15s. have been reduced to £3; of £2, to £1 5s.; of £11, to £6; of £7, to £4 5s.; of £7 6s. 4d., to £3 12s.; of £5, to £2 10s.; and of £5 10s., to £3. This gentleman would, no doubt, in this House support the idea that we might rely on the reasonableness of the landlords (hear, hear, and Irish cheers). I come to another noble lord, whose estate has been referred to, Lord Annaly, whose agent boasts that he can bully any tenant in Ireland into submission, and that he trampled on the Land League. So he did, I am sorry to say, and he used to go strutting about Dublin stating that he had broken down the Land League, and had tolerated no dictation from them. At last Lord Annaly's tenants summoned up courage to go into the Land Court, and here are some of the reductions:—£20 14s., to £11 7s.; £8 14s., to £4 15s.; £13, to £6 6s.; £20, to £12; £4, to £1 15s.; £24, to £13 10s. (loud Home Rule cheers). I was denounced because I recommended the tenants to combine and ask for 25 per cent. reduction.

I will leave the House now to judge of the conduct of the agent, who boasted and bragged in Dublin that he had beaten down the tenants and compelled them to pay the last penny.

Now we come to Lord Kenmare (loud cheers). We have been told that we have been unjust to Lord Kenmare; and this is a case to which I invite the attention of the Chief Secretary, because I warn him that in the case of Lord Kenmare's estate he will have great trouble this winter. It was stated in a letter the

other day that there have been very few evictions on this estate. I tell the House that I do not believe the statement in that letter was true, and even if it were true the sting was in the tail of it, for the agent said that if the rents were not paid he would proceed to evict every tenant who would not pay. What is the case with regard to the Kenmare estates? Here are some of the reductions made by the Court :—£27, to £17; £27, to £17; £6, to £3 10s.; £6, to £4; £35, to £22; £25, to £18; £50, to £30 (loud Home Rule cheers). I admit all the time that I am picking out the worst cases; but, I say, is this House prepared to support by the force and authority of the law in Ireland, men who are capable of dishonesty, such as this man, who can be declared in the face of England to be guilty of this gross injustice to our countrymen—men who have been proved to have extracted 100 per cent. more than what is a just rent, and who I venture to say, instead of returning some of this money to their tenants, will endeavour to compel them to pay all they owe at the rate of the old rent. This noble lord, who, no doubt, is shocked at the dishonesty of the Land League, was applied to the other day for the poor-rate and county cess, in respect of farms from which his tenants had been evicted; he refused to pay, and the magistrates refused to decree him for it. There is the honesty of the Irish landlords.

I come now to another, Lord Middleton, whose son is a member of the present government. Lord Middleton's tenants applied for a reduction the other day, and a deputation was sent representing some judicial tenants and some who were not judicial tenants. Lord Middleton refused to see the deputation, or to discuss with them the propriety of a reduction. And in a few days word was sent round from the agent's office, that no reduction would be granted on any judicial rents, and that the other cases would be considered separately. When the rents were not immediately paid, Lord Middleton proceeded against eight of the judicial tenants, by the most expensive process the law afforded, had their farms sold in Cork Courthouse; and the tenants being

terrified at the prospect of eviction and the loss of all their property in the improvements and buildings on their farms, bought in their farms ; and the law costs which these tenants had to pay amounted to £85. In order to buy in their farms and pay the costs, these men had to borrow from their friends, to raise money in the bank, and a public subscription was also raised to help them. And in the case of seven out of the eight, there was only a half year's rent due.

Now what was the crime for which these men were so ruthlessly punished. They had not refused to pay rent. On the contrary, it is notorious that they had always paid their rent regularly and punctually. But they had asked for a reduction, and hesitated to pay when any reduction was rudely and brutally refused. There are in Ireland at this moment, landlords who boast and brag that they would not take a penny under the judicial rent, and who look upon the judicial rents as sacred.

I don't want to weary the House, but I am entitled to make as strong a case as I can in respect to the question, which is all-important at the present moment. What right have the Government to anticipate that the Irish landlords will act justly by their tenants. I think I have made a pretty strong case (loud opposition cheers), and I will wind up with a reference to the hon. member who moved the rejection of this bill. That gentleman and his brother are not popular landholders in the south of Ireland ; I will go further, and say they were harsh and cruel landlords (cheers). I have got some facts here, which I think will make hon. members believe that I speak nothing more than the absolute truth. There is a circular dated March 15th, 1873, signed Penrose Fitzgerald, and issued to his tenants. This, I may say, was at the very acme of prosperity and high prices. The circular says :—

“ He was informed that some of his tenants held at a fair rent, and others much under the real value, and that his desire was to act fairly and justly to every tenant already in occupation—to leave him such a margin of profit as will enable him to live in comfort and respectability.”

MR. PENROSE FITZGERALD.—Will the hon. member read the whole of the circular?

MR. DILLON—It is too long to read wholly (oh ! oh !). I have said that I don't object to the terms of the circular for itself. I merely wished to quote the circular to show the estate was valued in 1873. Then I have a statement in reference to some recent occurrences on his estate. First, there is the case of William Wall, rent fixed in 1873 at £61, reduced about three years ago to £56, which is the present rate (hear, hear). The poor-law valuation is £43. No abatement off the March gale of 1885 was offered; an abatement of 20 per cent. off the September gale was offered. The tenant hesitated to accept it, and was served with a writ, and had to pay full rent and costs.

“Luke Shea; rent £26, valuation £20 5s. Rent was fixed by tenant's acceptance of landlord's offer about three years ago. Tenant accepted because he had no confidence in Land Court.

“Edmund Shea; rent £28 2s. 6d., valuation £22 10s. No abatement since this rent was fixed three years ago. During three years previous to fixing of present rent, was allowed 15 per cent. off the old rent. When present rent was fixed by landlord, tenant objected to sign agreement, until agent's clerk said to him :—‘Unless you consent to sign this agreement, you will be compelled to refund the allowance you have been receiving during the last three years.’

“John Shea; rent £14, valuation £12 10s. Judicial lease. No abatement.

“Mrs. McCarthy; rent £62, valuation £48 5s. No abatement at any time previous to this year; but 20 per cent. was offered last July if March rent of 1886, were paid; tenant was unable to pay.”

Now I come to a case which seems to be one of peculiar hardship :—

“Cornelius McDonnell; judicial tenant, rent £32, valuation £26. Last September, tenant owed a year's rent, and in common with other tenants asked for abatement, and offered to pay a year's rent, less 25 per cent.; asked for an interview with the agent, which was refused; agent's clerk told him that no abatement would be given; was served with writ on 1st January, 1886, and the interest in his farm sold by sheriff on 17th March.”

That is to say, he was proceeded against by the most expensive and deadly process the law admits of, and one which robbed him of his rights of redemption, and all rights sought to be conferred on Irish tenants by various acts passed in this House. Shortly after this, by the advice of friends who offered to lend him money, McDonnell went to the landlord's solicitor and offered the full rent and costs. Solicitor consulted agent, and then wrote to the tenant, as follows :—" Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald cannot accept your offer as matters have proceeded so far." McDonnell was evicted on 23rd August, and although he made an effort to settle on the day of eviction, the landlord's bailiff would not listen to him.

This is an example of the forbearance of the landlords. I appeal to the Englishmen opposite, to the English landlords who sit upon those benches, and ask them would they not be ashamed to sit silent when such charges as these were made against them (loud cheers). Is there one single English landlord who when his tenant had offered to pay 75 per cent. of the rent, and after the wretched tenant had been put to enormous cost, his interest sold out, and robbed of his rights by this cruel process of law (cheers), is there an English landlord I ask, who, if this tenant should then offer the full amount of the pound of flesh, the gift of his relatives and friends (cheers), the full rent with the double costs, those of the judgment of decree, and of the eviction on title, would refuse that offer and turn the wretched man and his family adrift on the world? (loud cheers). I do not believe that there is a landlord in England or Scotland who, if he had done such a deed, would not be ashamed to sit amongst his fellows in this House, and the hon. member who stood forward in this House, speaking as the representative of the landlords of Ireland, does not deny it (loud cheers). Is it to men whose forbearance is like this that you are going to trust for the peace of Ireland? (loud cheers). I appeal to you; do you look forward with satisfaction to have your forces placed at the command of the Lord Kenmares and the Lord Annalys, and to having the

livery of England's soldiers disgraced in carrying out their work, and the Irish constabulary moving in enormous masses to inflict on a wretched people as cruel an injustice as ever was done in the name of law? (loud cheers). There is not a man in this House who does not know if the landlords of Ireland try to extract to the uttermost the full measure of their legal rights in the coming winter, wrong—cruel, intolerable wrong—will be done, and the Irish tenants in the hour of their misery and of their despair will remember that this House turned a deaf ear to their appeal for justice, and treated the story of their sufferings with jeers and with contempt (enthusiastic cheers).

The hon. member the Solicitor-General for Ireland, in one of his flights of stormy eloquence (laughter), declared that only 1,300 families had been put out of their homes during the quarter ending 30th June last, and on this he consoled himself by the reflection that it was the normal number. The figures of the Chief Secretary have shown that at least 2,000 families will be turned out in the coming winter. I ask whether this House is content to accept this as the normal condition of Ireland?

I wish to draw the attention of the House to this question of Irish evictions, and more particularly with reference to one county, and that is the county where troubles have arisen. Where you have evictions there will you have trouble (cheers). I only point to this particular county, because I want to bring to the minds of English members two or three facts which must be realised before it is possible to understand the cause of agrarian disturbance in Ireland. I allude to the County of Kerry. Every Irishman knows that up to a few years ago Kerry was one of the most peaceable counties in Ireland. Any landlord (and I might even refer to the notorious Mr. Hussey himself), might wander through the most lonely parts of that county, and would be welcome in the humblest cabin (cheers). Seven or eight years ago there was not a landlord in Kerry who would not be as safe and as welcome in the house of his poorest tenant as he would be in his own. Now many a landlord in Kerry

cannot venture from his home without a guard (Ministerial cheers and counter cheers). One would suppose that they were in one of the most disturbed spots of a far Eastern land. How was the change brought about? (cheers). I ask the attention of the House to these figures. In 1877 the total number of evictions in the County of Kerry was 18 families; in 1878 it was 26, in 1879 it was 70, in 1880 it was 191, in 1881 it was 192, in 1882 it was 293, in 1883 it was 403, in 1884 it was 410, in 1885 it was 358—making a total for these six disturbed and fatal years, of 11,304 human beings driven from their homes in that county alone (sensation). Is not that explanation enough for any reasonable man? (cheers). And when we look at the last returns, we find that that state of things, so far from improving, is going on steadily from bad to worse. During the three months ending on the 30th of June last, we find that in the County of Kerry there were 187 families driven from their homes. Of these, 73 were restored—giving a total of 114 families driven absolutely in three months from their houses out on the roadside (cheers). In the face of this, are we to be told that this House is to rely upon the toleration and forbearance of the Irish landlords? I appeal to hon. members, is it reasonable to expect that we should be content with assurances like these? We do not rely upon the forbearance of the Irish landlords, because we who have read the history of Ireland know it is a rotten reed to lean upon (cheers). I have never denied that there have been landlords in Ireland who have acted the part of just and reasonable men. You never hear of them, because they do not dispute with their tenants, but there is always a large residuum sufficient to keep the country almost in a state of civil war—men who have had no bowels of compassion, who boast and brag, and their tenantry fear them (cheers). It is against this class of men we demand protection from this House. If this House refuses the protection—if this House comes to the conclusion that the tenantry of Ireland must be left as they were left six years ago, without any relief except what they can win by their own exer-

tions, all I can say is that in my opinion this House, and more especially the Unionists in this House, will have made a deep and weighty mistake (cheers).

There is one argument which has been urged upon me privately by hon. members on that side of the House, and by Unionists on this side, against our demand for the National Self-government of Ireland, and it is this :—that this House is never deaf to an appeal from the Irish members ; and they have often told me that if we brought forward our grievances they would be remedied (Ministerial cheers). Now this bill is declared to be urgent by the whole of the National party, and even the leaders of the Irish Conservatives have not said one word against it. And yet it would seem that the Government have made up their minds not to give us this bill. That is a mistake for the Unionists of England. It is a deeper mistake for the landlords of Ireland. It has been said that we introduced this bill in bad faith. I deny it. We introduced it as the most moderate measure that we could lay before this House, and at the same time say that it would secure peace through this winter in Ireland. I know there are tenants whom this bill would not save ; but what I do say is that it would do away with all danger of widespread disturbance, and that the trouble which would come if the bill were passed would be local and trifling. If this bill passed, we should be in a position honestly and loyally to exercise our influence to keep the country quiet, and to induce the people to endure patiently whatever sufferings they might have to bear.

I remember the same class of arguments were used against the Compensation for Disturbance Bill in 1880 (hear, hear). I remember as well as yesterday leaving the House of Lords after that bill had been rejected—greatly rejoiced, because I believed that act was the knell of Irish landlordism. But I am six years an older man than I was then ; many things have happened in that interval—and I know better now what a struggle between landlord and tenant in Ireland means ; and while I am prepared

to go into that struggle, and while I am confident of the result (loud cheers), I was anxious sincerely and honestly that the truce of God, to use the words of the member for West Birmingham, should be prolonged in Ireland; until we could lay before the people of England our arguments for the cause for which we have so long striven, in the justice of which we firmly believe, and which we are confident of commanding to their reason and their conscience (hear, hear).

I look forward with dislike and dread to the tumult of passion which will be let loose in Ireland by the rejection of this bill; and while I say I fear not the ultimate consequences, I am sorry that the Government has sent us back to our country with a message of hatred and defiance (cheers)—to tell the people that this House will do them no justice; to tell them that they have got nothing to trust to but the combination which saved them in 1880, and which has won for them every single right they have gained (cheers). Our course is perfectly clear. We have to-night brought forward this bill with a sincere desire to have peace this winter in Ireland. This House has denied the tenant justice. I go back to Ireland to tell the tenant that if he wishes to live he must trust to his own exertions (prolonged Irish cheers); and so long as I have life and liberty, so long shall I tell the people of Ireland to continue in that course of persistent and determined agitation, by which in the past they have won every single liberty which they possess, and every concession which has been granted them, and by which in the future, if they will only show perseverance and bravery, they will win—in spite of Irish landlords and in spite of this House—the right to live as freemen in their native land (cheers).

THE DIVISION.

The House then divided—

For the second reading,	...	202
Against, 	297
Majority against,	...	95

The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) **Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill.** By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) **The Orange Bogey.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) **The Chicago Convention.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (4) **The Irish Land Crisis.**
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (5) **The "Castle" System.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (6) **The Truth about '98.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (7) **Irish Industries and English Legislation.**
By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (8) **The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.**
By CHARLES DAWSON, Ex-M.P.
- (9) **An Irish Judge on the Irish Question.**
With Introduction by J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (10) **Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.**
By ALFRED WEBB.
Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- The Elections of 1885.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- Coercion.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

Price One Penny each.

A Word for Ireland. By T. M. HEALY, B.L. Price 1s.
Report on the Present State of the Irish Land Question.
By A LAND VALUER. Price 6d.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms, to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.

 *Other Tracts in preparation.*

NO. 2.

The Irish Question.

THE ORANGE BOGEY :

BY

JOHN J. CLANCY, M. A.
M.P. for North Dublin.

LONDON :
THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1886

Price One Penny.

R. D. Webb and Son, Printers, Abbey-street, Dublin.

THE ORANGE BOGEY.

PART I.

ORANGE THREATS.

THE threats of civil war now so frequently uttered on Orange platforms and in Orange newspapers are a source of unfailing and infinite amusement to every one in Ireland outside the Orange lodges, for every Irishman knows that they are mere sound and fury, signifying nothing. When the advertisement for "20,000 Snider rifles" appeared a short time since in the chief Orange newspaper in Ulster, the Tipperary man who advertised in return for "20,000 rotten eggs," expressed accurately enough the Irish view of the nature of the situation, created by that famous "call to arms."

The extreme complacency with which the overwhelming majority of Irishmen regard the Orange threats, arises not alone from the public knowledge of the absolute powerlessness of the Orange party to keep up a civil war in any part of Ireland, even for one day, but also from the fact that similar threats have been uttered in behalf of the same party times without number in the past, and that not one of them has ever been fulfilled.

On the occasion of *every* great reform proposed for Ireland this century, the Orangemen have threatened to resist it, even at the expense of their lives ; but, the decision of Parliament once given, they have invariably refrained from even attempting to carry out their bellicose programme. From the time of Catholic Emancipation down to the present, their course is strewn with their blood-curdling but entirely unfulfilled resolutions.

When Catholic Emancipation came within “the region of practical politics,” the Orangemen raised the most tremendous clamour that has been heard in the three Kingdoms since the days of James II. To allow Catholics into Parliament was pronounced to be a fatal attack on the “Constitution of 1688,” and on the birthright of every Protestant, and meetings were held in town and country to give expression to the determination of the Orange party “never to submit” to such a measure, under any circumstances. The meetings of the “Brunswick Clubs,” which were established in Dublin and elsewhere, were availed of for the delivery of the most bloodthirsty threats in case Emancipation was carried. Thus, in the *Dublin Morning Post* of 11th December, 1828, there is a report of a meeting of the Dublin Brunswick Club, at which one Judkin Butler closed a fiery speech against any concession to the Catholics with the following choice quatrain:—

“Surrender!—no, we never will
While Brunswickers have blood to spill;
Our cause is glorious, and for that we'll fight
For George's title and for William's right.”

The Dublin newspapers of 1828 and 1829 are full of speeches of which the essence may be said to be condensed in the foregoing four lines.

It need not be added that the furious Brunswickers never rose in arms against the Act of Emancipation. They contented themselves with making the best of the new situation, and at the same time, as if they had kept their word, they proclaimed, year after year, on the 12th July, that they would “rise as one man” and “spill the last drop of their blood” before surrendering any of “the blood-bought rights” of 1688!

THE DISESTABLISHMENT PERIOD.

It is pretty generally known that the Orangemen renewed their “civil war” threats on the introduction of the Church Temporalities Bill of 1833, and again on the occasion of the

Municipal Reform Act—with the result that they refrained, as usual, from any sanguinary sacrifice of themselves when the time for redeeming their promises had arrived. But when we come to the period of the Disestablishment of the Irish Protestant Church we find the Orangemen putting on their choicest war-paint, and, in company with various sympathisers amongst the rest of the “loyal minority,” filling the air with their loudest and most fearful threats of physical resistance to the decrees of Parliament.

In 1868 and 1869 Orange meetings were being continually held, at which the threatened measure of disestablishment and disendowment was treated as a fearful national crime, the consummation of which was, if necessary, to be followed instantly by an Orange rising. The orators at those meetings included lords as well as commoners, clerics as well as laymen, military men as well as civilians; and all vied with one another in the effort to make it plain that in a certain contingency—that is, if Mr. Gladstone’s Bill passed—war was to result. Letters and leading articles in the Orange newspapers to the same effect as the speeches and resolutions appeared from day to day during the time mentioned.

We give a few extracts—quoting mostly from the chief Dublin organ of the Orange party—the *Daily Express*.

“KICKING THE QUEEN’S CROWN INTO THE BOYNE.”

The Rev. John Flanagan was one of the favorite and most conspicuous and magnificent figures on the Orange platforms during the anti-disestablishment agitation, and also one of the most outspoken and warlike. At a meeting at Newbliss, Co. Monaghan, on the 20th March, 1868, he made a celebrated speech, in which a phrase occurs that has since become, as it were, classical. We quote from the *Northern Whig* of the 21st March of the year mentioned :—

“If they ever dare to lay unholy hands upon the church, 200,000 Orangemen will tell them it shall never be. Protestant loyalty must

make itself understood. People will say, ‘Oh, your loyalty is conditional. I say it is conditional, and it must be explained as such. Will you, Orangemen of Ireland, endorse the doctrine of unconditional loyalty? (Repeated cries of ‘No, never.’) It appears wonderful that there is one thing upon which we can confidently throw ourselves, and which has been overlooked by nearly all speakers—I mean the Queen’s Coronation oath. She should be reminded that one of her ancestors, who swore to maintain the Protestant religion, forgot his oath, *and his crown was kicked into the Boyne.* (He then read the oath, and the questions put to the Archbishop of Canterbury at the time of the coronation.) Will any minister dare to ask the Queen to perjure herself? Will any minister come and ask us to surrender our rights? *We must tell our gracious Queen that if she break her oath, she has no longer any claim to the crown.* Let us not put any trust in man, but trust to God and ourselves—

Put your trust in God, my boys,
And keep your powder dry.”

The Rev. Mr. Flanagan was quite as warlike a year later. On the 12th July, 1869, at a meeting in the same place—Newbliss, Co. Monaghan—he proposed, according to the report in the *Daily Express*, the following resolution :—

“That, looking on the Irish Church Bill of Mr. Gladstone as a distinct violation of the Act of Union, as coercing her Majesty the Queen to violate her coronation oath, as trampling on the Bill of Rights, and as having a most certain tendency to introduce disaffection, distrust, and strife amongst the several classes and denominations in this country, we pledge ourselves to resist its adoption at every stage, and are determined never to submit to the consequences of its becoming law.”

The *Derry Standard*—a Whig Presbyterian journal—recently stated that Mr. Flanagan was up to the time of his death quite proud of his warlike threats in 1868 and 1869; but he never carried any of them into effect, although the Queen did, in his view, forget and break her oath.

OTHER CLERICAL PRONOUNCEMENTS.

Many other clerical pronouncements, similar in effect, but not so picturesque as Mr. Flanagan’s great speech at Newbliss, were made at the time in question.

Trinity College, Dublin, supplied more than one warlike agitator seventeen years ago. The Rev. W. H. Ferrar, F.T.C.D. made one of the most spirited of the "civil war" speeches of the period at a Rathmines meeting on the 6th March, 1868, Sir Edward Grogan and other influential men of the Orange party being present. We quote from the *Freeman's Journal* :—

" If the Church Establishment be destroyed in Ireland, there cannot, there shall not, there must not be peace in Ireland. . . . If they think the Protestants of Ireland will succumb without a struggle, they know not the men with whom they have to deal. That I say solemnly before God. If they want us to die as martyrs, we will die as soldiers.

. . . Protestants of all denominations would stand shoulder to shoulder, as they did behind the walls of Derry. They will stand shoulder to shoulder as they did at the passage of the Boyne."

Mr. Ferrar has since died, but he did not die, we are happy to say, either as a soldier or as a martyr.

One of the meetings which were to have had the most terrifying effect on Mr. Gladstone and his "co-conspirators" was that held early in May, 1868, in Portadown, under the presidency of the Duke of Manchester, and the most warlike deliverance at that meeting was the speech of the Rev. Thomas Ellis. From this speech, as reported in the *Belfast News-letter*, we quote the following magnificent passage, the meaning of which it is impossible to mistake :—

" We will fight as men alone can fight who have the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other. We will fight—nay, if needs be, we will die—die as our fathers died before us, as our sons will die who succeed us. Yes, we will die, if needs be ; and this will be our dying cry—echoed and re-echoed from earth to heaven and from heaven to earth, echoed and re-echoed from one end of Ulster to the other—' No Popery ! No surrender ! ' "

This rousing passage must have made a deep impression on the leaders of the Orange party, for we find several of them subsequently using, without acknowledgment, the phrase, "the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other." To this day

those stirring words are in frequent use in Orange speeches. But Mr. Ellis, who, we believe, is still alive, has not yet "fought."

The speech of the Rev. John Nash Griffin, D.D., in the Dublin Exhibition Palace, on 14th June, 1869 (see *Express*), was in the best style of those days. Take the following passage :—

"The spirit of Protestantism might have slumbered ; but it was not dead. The spirit that snapped the boom in the Foyle, the spirit that closed the gates of Derry, that chased the craven followers of James from the walls, and drove them like a flock of frightened sheep into the Boyne, still lived."

Take, again, the speech of the Rev. Henry Henderson at a great Orange open air meeting on Tamnamore Hill, Co. Tyrone, on 8th June, 1869. We take the following passage from the *Express* report :—

"A newspaper had been abusing the High Sheriff and himself, saying that they were blustering about rebellion. He now said : Yes, they would sacrifice their lives before they would allow their religious rights to be taken from them. Yes, with the blessing of God, they would do what their fathers did at Derry, Aughrim, and at the Boyne. So far as he was concerned, let there be no mistake. He spoke now not rashly, but calmly and deliberately. Mr. Gladstone and his co-conspirators were driving the country into civil war.

It was at the same meeting that the House of Commons got a warning that ought to have made it mend its manners, but which had not, it appears, that effect. The Rev. Leslie Canter said, according to the report in the *Express* :—

"The Orangemen would not allow Gladstone and his crew to trample on the throne and the Protestant constitution. They would compel the House of Commons to listen to the voice of the men of Ulster, although they had refused to listen to their noble representative, Mr. Vernon. Only the Channel rolled between them ; they, the Protestants of the North, would march to the House of Commons, and compel their enemies to be silent while their representatives were speaking. If Barrett was executed for blowing up a prison, the time might not be far

distant when, for attempting to blow up our venerable Protestant constitution, Gladstone and his co-conspiritors might be hanging as high as Haman.”

The *Times*, notwithstanding all those threats of civil war, somehow was induced to sneer at the Orange party, and hint that they were not, after all, in earnest. Accordingly, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Ossory answered the *Times* as follows at a Conference of the Diocese of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, on 1st April, 1869 (see *Express*) :—

“The *Times* sneered, and said they would soon submit. The *Times* knew nothing of Irish Protestants, and might be excused, so far, for judging them from the experience of a craven few who would accept any terms.”

How wonderfully like the answers given to similar sneers at the Orange threats of to-day ! “They don’t know the men with whom they have to deal !”

We give as a closing specimen of clerical oratory the lines with which the Rev. C. Maginniss wound up a speech at Omagh (see *Express* of 14th June, 1869) :—

“ Our bosoms we’ll bare to the glaring strife,
Our vows are recorded on high ;
To prevail in the cause is dearer than life,
Or crushed in its ruins to die.”

LEGAL WARRIORS.

Some of the “loyal” lawyers talked so valiantly in the Disestablishment era that one is forced to the conclusion that the Irish bar contains a large reserve of military prowess.

Mr. Plunkett, Q.C., now M.P. for Dublin University, spoke the following passage at a great Diocesan Conference held in the chapter-room of St. Patrick’s Cathedral, Dublin, on 31st March, 1869, and reported in the *Daily Express* of the following day :—

“ We appeal to our brother Protestants in England, Scotland, and Wales to stand by us *in this last awful hour of our fortunes*. . . . We call upon them not to allow those provisions to be made law which

are calculated to hamper and injure our organization in the future, and we call upon them not to drive us again to that old kind of material, physical resistance, which accompanied the first protesting of our forefathers three centuries ago—which accompanied the second protest in this kingdom by our forefathers two hundred years ago, which accompanied the glorious struggle for liberty and Protestantism of our predecessors, and was a protest in act and word which they were willing to seal with their blood in martyrdom and battle, if need be, to protest against the oppression and the slavery of a system which they could not, and should not, and which their descendants never will submit to."

The Protestants of England did nothing to hold Mr. Plunkett back from "that old kind of material, physical resistance" to which he so ominously referred. Yet, instead of taking the field, he took office in the first Tory Government formed after his election, and he has since conducted himself as a peaceable citizen.

Mr. D. M'Causland, Q.C., was quite as warlike as Mr. Plunkett. At a great meeting held in the Exhibition Palace, Dublin, on 14th June, 1868, and reported in the faithful *Express*, this gentleman delivered a speech, in the course of which the following passage occurs :—

"The promoters of the Bill reminded him of the beast referred to in Revelations as rising from the earth, with two horns like a lamb, and that spake like a dragon. Truly, the Messrs. Gladstone, Bright, and Co. had, previous to and at the last election contests, appeared like sheep, but now they were veritable dragons. They were now known, however ; and a million and a-half of Protestants of all denominations were ready in that country to oppose them ; not like a rebel horde, acting according to the command of a priest or a demagogue, but as men who thought for themselves, having the feeling strongly within them that what had been purchased by the blood of their ancestors should be retained, even at the expense of their own, if necessary."

At the same meeting, Mr. J. H. Nunn, a solicitor, made the usual reference to the "accident" which befell the Crown of James II. Said Mr. Nunn :—

"The House of Commons, with Mr. Gladstone its leader, is now taking a course similar to that by which James II. lost his throne. If

the revolution of 1688, under which our present beloved monarch holds the sceptre of this kingdom, was justified, the same means by which that revolution was achieved would be lawful to be used in maintaining it.”

Mr. Falkiner, Q.C., was not the least spirited of his order. At a meeting of the Central Protestant Defence Association, in the Metropolitan Hall, Dublin, on 15th April, 1869, reported in the *Daily Express*, we find him speaking as follows :—

“They must tell Mr. Gladstone that they would give him no assistance ; they must tell him that if they could not valiantly succeed, they could *nobly die*.”

Mr. Falkiner has not yet, we are glad to say, died nobly or otherwise ; he has only gone on the bench as Recorder of Dublin, and since his elevation thereto has displayed a very laudable interest in the social condition of the masses of his fellow-citizens.

DECLARATIONS OF “GRAND MASTERS.”

The Grand Masters, and the Deputy Grand Masters, of the Orange Lodges, spoke out magnificently. We quote the following extracts from the *Daily Express*. A. H. Foster, G.M., wrote as follows on the 5th February, 1869 :—

“I confidently believe that the distinct, direct, and clearly indicated issues of this unmitigated Jacobite policy are revolution, dismemberment, and humiliation of the Empire, subversion of our institutions, civil and religious, and ultimately civil war ; for experience teaches that England, Ireland, or Scotland will not tamely submit to these issues ; and experience further teaches that the right will receive the aid of the God of battles, and be successful. But it behoves all who love their country and countrymen of every denomination—all who love their God (who, though King of battles, is also God of peace), to take warning and exert themselves earnestly, while it is yet time, to avert these calamities and the fearful scenes of bloodshed and carnage in a civil war.”

Richard Lloyd, D.G.M., Co. Tyrone, thundered forth as follows on 7th June, 1869, on Tannamore Hill (see *Express* of following day) :—

“They had met to protect the Bible, they had met not to allow Gladstone to seal that book, not to allow Paul Cullen to substitute another for it. Their fathers had marched to the Boyne, and bled for their country. Their blood still ran in the veins of those whom he addressed. They were as many and as ready, at the beat of drum, to go out and take their minié rifles, and march to that river, as their fathers did before them.”

No such abundant use, assuredly, was ever made before of one’s “fathers” and “forefathers.” Almost every Orange orator invoked his “fathers” and “grandfathers” as the crowning threat of his speech.

AWAKE AT LAST.

Mr. Robert Staples, of the Queen’s County, put the whole Orange case in a nutshell, as one might say, in the following passage in a letter to the *Express*, on the 25th March, 1869 :—

“I am happy to say the Protestants of Ireland are now beginning in earnest to see the danger, and the old spirit is awake again. In plain, clear, and unmistakable language has England been told that we are not to be trampled on with impunity, and that we do not mean to submit to it. Let not proud England think we ask for mercy, or seek for terms. We would scorn to do so.”

And lest England might miss the significance of all those declarations, the *Daily Express* pointed the moral as follows, in a leader, on the 13th July, 1869 :—

“No statesman can any longer affect to ignore or disguise the state of feeling of the Protestants of Ulster. The proceedings yesterday were stamped with the features characteristic of that remarkable race. The steady determination, the indomitable will, and the orderly organization which characterize the men of Ulster were everywhere apparent.”

We hear now once more precisely the same sort of reference to the Orangemen’s opposition to Home Rule, and it is still supposed that it will be taken seriously by England !

PART II.

THE ORANGE PARTY AND THE UNION.

The Orange party now denounce all attempts even to modify the Act of Union, and, as usual, say they will have civil war rather than have that Act changed in the slightest degree. But in 1869 their attitude in regard to it was altogether different. They announced that the Union would be “virtually repealed” if the Church Bill passed, they threatened to “bury” it, and they threatened England with their vengeance if she dared to touch the Fifth—or, “Church”—Article.

In proof we again give a series of quotations from the Orange organ, the *Daily Express*, of Dublin.

“VIRTUALLY DISSOLVED.”

The following resolution was adopted at the “great Orange meeting” on Tamnamore Hill, Co. Tyrone, on the 7th June, 1869, on the motion of the Rev. Henry Henderson, one of the foremost lights of the Orange order :—

“That, as Mr. Gladstone’s Bill violates the solemn compact upon which the Legislative Union between England and Ireland depends, we feel bound to announce that, in case it should pass the House of Lords and become law, we shall consider the Act of Union *virtually repealed*.”

An Orange meeting at Monaghan, on 6th April, 1869, adopted the following resolution on the motion of Messrs. Nunn and Flanagan :—

“That we shall continue to uphold the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland so long as the international compact is respected and held inviolable by the British Parliament ; but, should the Fifth Article of the Treaty of Union—which is expressed to be essential, fundamental, and perpetual—be repealed, we shall be forced to regard the Union as *virtually dissolved*.”

On 8th April, 1869, at an Orange meeting at Clones, in the same county, Capt. W. Wolseley Madden, D.G.M., proposed, and got passed, a similar declaration, as follows :—

“That, while we are, and always have been, distinguished by our unwavering loyalty to the Crown and government of England, in the face of long-continued and studied neglect and coldness on their part towards the Protestants of Ireland, and while we are, and always have been, since its formation, the chief support of the union between Great Britain and Ireland, and desire to remain so as long as the international compact is respected and held inviolable by the British Parliament, we declare that we shall regard the Union as *virtually dissolved* in the event of Mr. Gladstone’s Irish Church Bill becoming law.”

At a meeting of the Ulster Protestant Defence Association, held on Wednesday, 31st March, 1869, in the Ulster Hall, Belfast, attended by the Marquis of Downshire, the Earl of Enniskillen, Lord O’Neill, Viscount Cole, Sir Thomas Bateson, and many other Orange notabilities, the following resolution was proposed by John Thompson, Esq., High Sheriff of the County of Antrim :—

“That we shall continue to uphold the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland as long as the international compact is respected and held inviolable by the British Parliament; but should the Fifth Article of the Treaty of the Union—which is expressed to be essential, fundamental, and perpetual—be repealed, *we shall be forced to regard the Union as virtually dissolved.*”

This resolution was seconded by William Johnston, M.P. (Ballykilbeg), and adopted by the meeting. And this is the gentleman who now talks of “lining the ditches of Ulster with rifles” in case a Home Rule measure should be passed.

A GRAND CHAPLAIN GOES FOR SEPARATION !

At an Orange meeting in Dublin (see *Express* 13th July, 1869), at which Thomas F. Caldbeck, J.P. G.M., occupied the chair, the Rev. Thomas Wallace, Deputy Grand Chaplain, declared not merely for a dissolution of the Union in a certain contingency, but for *absolute separation*.

“When the Protestant chain that unites Protestant England and Protestant Ireland is severed, *the two countries are separated for ever.*”

The same rev. gentleman made the following significant declaration at a meeting in the Dublin Metropolitan Hall, on 4th June, 1869 :—

“ He wished them to mark well what he said. He was not speaking hastily or rashly ; but if they were to be charged with disloyalty, they would tell England, as he believed that meeting did, that if such a time should ever come as 1848, and if England looked to the Protestants for hearty sympathy with the Union, they would fold their arms ; they would say, ‘The Union was dissolved when that Bill was signed by the Sovereign.’ ”

“ THE IRON HOOF OF ENGLAND.”

The Rev. John Flanagan, of course, who wanted to kick the Queen’s crown into the Boyne, was not behind the times on this topic. In a speech at Ballybay, on the 2nd June, 1869, in which he referred to the Prime Minister as “ Judas Iscariot Gladstone,” he thus dealt with the question of the Union :—

“ They must have the Act [of Union] in its entirety or not at all ; and he would contend that the minute the obnoxious Bill received the sign manual of the Queen, the solemn compact was repealed, it was broken, and therefore, in all equity void. They would reject the iron hoof of England, and get rid of the Papacy at the same time—driving two serpents out of the island at once.”

A. H. Foster, D.G.M., pronounced the doom of the Union as follows :—

“ If Mr. Gladstone destroyed the Act of Union by passing this Bill, they would give the Union an Irish wake and a Protestant burial.”

“ POSITIVE AND SUBSTANTIVE ” PROPOSALS.

Some of the Orange leaders did not confine themselves to mere contingent threats ; they made proposals for a determined agitation against the Union, when they found that the threats of “ civil war ” and of “ nobly dying ” (Falkiner-fashion) were producing no effect on the incredulous mind of Mr. Gladstone.

A PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE ORANGE RULES.

A very pronounced and indeed “advanced” declaration was that made at Newbliss, Co. Monaghan, on the 30th June, 1870 (see the Irish daily papers of the time), “one thousand *bona fide* members” of the Orange Institution being amongst others present :—

“ That we, the Orangemen of the district of Dartrey, Co. Monaghan, denounce the despotic Processions Act of Mr. Chichester Fortescue as intolerable, inconsistent with the rights of freemen, and one to which we shall never submit, and that this, added to other innumerable acts of injustice and wrong towards Ireland, forces upon us the conviction that England can no longer be permitted to legislate for this country. And we hereby proclaim our resolve that Irishmen shall not be slaves in their own land, and we call upon all classes of our countrymen to assist us by every legal means to assert our freedom. We also respectfully press upon the authorities of the Orange institution in the Grand Lodge of Ireland, the necessity of restoring our book of rules and regulations to what it was before 1849, and keeping its original and fundamental objects in view.”

It should be here explained that in 1849 the Orange Society pledged itself to maintain the English connection ; and it will be seen further on that the Grand Lodge had before it, a year later, a proposal carrying out the suggestion in the last sentence of the foregoing resolution, and that this proposal met with a favourable reception.

AN ORANGE “ UNITED IRISHMAN.”

Grand Master A. H. Foster of Donegal, wrote as follows to the *Daily Express* of 7th April, 1869 :—

“ Let there be a committee at once formed to prepare for this crisis, and in the first place to obtain signatures to a petition to our gracious sovereign Victoria, Queen of Ireland (united or disunited)—a petition as of right, that our Queen will, without delay, summon a parliament for Ireland. This petition should be ready, but, of course, not presented till the Act of Disunion is consummated. . . . We shall now see who are sincere and who are they who have been for

years deluding their countrymen for private purposes ; and history may yet record that the Council of the United Irishmen of 1869 inaugurated a new era of prosperity for Ireland.”

“WHAT HAVE WE TO FEAR ? ”

Some of the “loyal minority” began, too, to argue the matter as if they were really in earnest, and to ask themselves what after all did they gain by the Union, and what would they lose by its dissolution. Take the following letter in the *Daily Express* of 14th May, 1869, from C. Downing, J.P., Co. Mayo :—

“The people really do desire a repeal of the Union, whatever they may care for the Church. Protestant landlords hold seven-eighths of the Irish soil ; let them individually and simultaneously call together their tenantry, address them on the subject of a Repeal of the Union, and put the question to the vote. The nature of the reply it is easy to anticipate. This will set the agitation agoing. Say, what do we gain by the Union ? Why, a more than proportionate share of the burden of taxation, without the slightest advantage of expenditure in return. The Church question gone, what have we to fear in a Repeal of the Union ? In legislating for ourselves the common weal will become the common aim. Let the timid face the subject boldly, examine it on all sides, and then fears will vanish. Let us clamour for Repeal. Let but some prominent man take the initiative, and, my word for it, there will be a merry gathering of foresters to lay the axe to the true upas tree, English ascendancy, beneath whose baneful shade this country is, as she ever has been, blighted.”

CATHOLICS NOT THE ONLY NATIONALISTS.

The *Daily Express* began to point out, even before Mr. Downing wrote, that Irish Catholics had not been the only Irish Nationalists in the past, and might not be the only Nationalists in the future. In its issue of 20th February, 1869, it wrote :—

“The assumption is perfectly unfounded that the Protestants of Ireland may be treated by the Imperial Legislature in any way they please, without danger of alienating their affection from the English connection. The Irish Nationalist party has not always been Roman Catholic. To say nothing of Swift and Molyneux, who have some claim to the title of

Nationalists, what of the Volunteers of 1782? The leaders in 1798 were many of them Protestants. The Protestants of Ireland are attached to England, not as their fatherland, but as the great champion of the Reformed faith, by whom they are protected in the exercise of their religion, the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, and the possession of their just rights and ancient property. But if England breaks faith with the Protestants of Ireland, if she deprives the descendants of the colonists of Ulster of the provision for their religious wants, on the assurance of which their ancestors were induced to settle in the country, she will sever the tie by which the most loyal and devoted subjects of the Crown are united in sympathy with Protestant England."

As it actually happened, many Orangemen were amongst the original members of the Home Rule Association founded in 1870 by Mr. Isaac Butt, and in the *Dublin Evening Mail* (Orange newspaper) of the 10th February, 1871, we find a statement to the effect that at a meeting of the Grand Orange Lodge in Dublin, Brother Edward Waller, D.G.M. of Ireland, in the chair, the following resolution was put to the vote, and had 22 supporters against 18 opponents :—

“Resolved—That all statements and provisions in the objects, rules, and formularies of the Orange institution, which impose any obligation upon its members to maintain the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, be expunged therefrom.”

It should be added that this resolution was preceded by a rider proposed by the Rev. Mr. Potter, reciting that by the passing of the Church Act the Union had been “*de facto* repealed.”

The foregoing are only a few of a multitude of similar declarations, resolutions, and letters, published in 1869.

It is unnecessary here to mention that before the Union was accomplished, the Orange party took a leading part in opposing the project; almost every Orange Lodge in Ireland declared it to be utterly destructive of the rights, liberties, and prosperity of Ireland. Even after 1800, but before Catholic Emancipation was enacted, declarations that the Union had been a disastrous measure came from the Orange camp.

A DILEMMA.

Those Orange anti-Union proceedings put the Orange party into a pretty dilemma.

Either the Orangemen in 1869 were sincere in their anti-Union crusade, or they were not.

If they were sincere, it is clear that they do not in their hearts believe Home Rule to be the terribly treasonable and destructive thing they now picture it to be, and that their present denunciations of all who support it are unfounded and ridiculous.

If they were not sincere, their anti-Union pronouncements simply afford another illustration of their boundless capacity for “bounce,” and of the folly of regarding any of their threats as in any degree serious.

PART III.

ORANGE PRINCIPLES.

The Orange party are never tired boasting of their loyalty ; but they have always said at the same time, and they say now, that their loyalty is conditional ; and from the foregoing narrative it will be seen that they think themselves quite free to rise in insurrection whenever Parliament passes a law for Ireland which they do not like. They have even threatened England, in such contingencies, with their mortal hatred.

They say they desire to inflict no injustice on their Catholic fellow-countrymen ; but they have at the same time said repeatedly that what they want is “Protestant ascendancy,” and it is a hateful ascendancy—hateful to liberty-loving Protestants as well as to Catholics—which they wish to preserve when they oppose Home Rule.

Their principles may be beautiful in theory ; but they have not prevented them from opposing every reform of the present century.

ORANGE LOYALTY.

To illustrate the depth of the affection which the Orange party say they always have for England and its laws, we give the following extract from a letter signed "An Irishman," who was also evidently an Orangeman, in the congenial *Daily Express* of 19th March, 1869 :—

" My counsel then is that the Protestants of Ireland should at once, and with no uncertain sound, declare that, in the event of their being treated with such base ingratitude and gross injustice for the purpose of gratifying a band of ultramontane ecclesiastics, who have conspired against the civil and religious liberty of Irishmen, they will henceforth regard Great Britain with feelings very different from those which they have hitherto entertained. *I myself know Protestants who, in the event of Mr. Gladstone's policy becoming law, will not only cherish in their own breasts, but will also instil into the hearts of their children, the deepest hatred towards those who will have treated them with such perfidy.* Indeed, it requires no prophet to foresee the terrible retribution that is in store for Great Britain, if she be insane enough to sanction the abominable policy of Mr. Gladstone."

Other Orange writers at the same time, like the Rev. W. Richards Vowell, D.D., of Clondulty, Cashel (see *Daily Express* of 10th March, 1869), declared that the party had been "too loyal," and that "as a virtue became a vice by its excess, so loyalty might degenerate into an apathetic and cringing servility."

It is now a matter of history that the Orangemen entered into a conspiracy to set the Duke of Cumberland on the throne instead of Queen Victoria.

WHAT THE ORANGEMEN WANT.

An address of the Orange Corporation of Dublin, of the 11th September, 1792, contains the most explicit declaration of Orange principles the present writer has met with, and it is there specified that the "Protestant Ascendancy" which the party had "resolved with their lives and fortunes to maintain,"

consisted in “a Protestant King of Ireland, a Protestant Parliament, a Protestant hierarchy, Protestant electors and Government, the benches of justice, the army and the revenue, through all their branches and details, Protestant.” But as this may be thought “ancient history,” let us come down to what was demanded by some of the most trusted of the Orange leaders in 1869.

At a meeting at Saintfield, County Down, on 12th July, 1869, William Beers, Grand Master of Down, in the chair, the Rev. Henry Henderson, of Holywood, made the following declaration, according to the *Express* report, amid tremendous applause and innumerable rounds of “Kentish fire” :—

“It was not the Fenians they were afraid of, but that policy to which he had just referred, and which was driving the people of Ulster into civil war. It was right they should tell their English brethren the truth. It was right that they should tell them that as long as there was Protestantism in the land and a Protestant Sovereign occupying the throne, so long must there be Protestant ascendancy ; and they were determined never to surrender that Protestantism or be false to it.”

The Rev. Henry Burdett, chairman of an Orange meeting at Newbliss, County Monaghan, held on the 21st March, 1869, was even more explicit. We take the following extract from the *Northern Whig* report of his speech on that occasion :—

“We see people telling us that we should not be aspiring to ascendancy. Now I, as long as ever the Lord shall leave me breath, will never be content with anything but Protestant ascendancy. I think it is time to stand upon the watch tower and cry ‘No surrender.’ I believe in my heart and soul that the Roman Catholics of this country are in a most deplorable state of idolatry. I believe a Roman Catholic dying as such, is lost, and lost for ever. People in these days are afraid to speak the truth, and try to stop the mouths of those that would, and particularly of such brethren as Mr. Johnston, of Ballykilbeg.”

And what the Orange party really fear at the present day is not that they will be injured by Home Rule, but that they will lose the ascendancy they still possess (on the magisterial bench, for

instance), and of which it is erroneously supposed that Catholic Emancipation deprived them.

This ascendancy they take every opportunity of preserving. During the six months the late Tory Government held office, the already glaring disproportion between the number of Catholic and Protestant magistrates in Ireland was aggravated beyond all example. According to a parliamentary return obtained by Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien, M.P., a few months ago, in Dublin County—to take one instance out of thirty-two—thirty magistrates were appointed in the period mentioned, and about twenty of them are Protestants, and, we believe, Tories. Before this addition to the County Dublin bench, there were, roughly speaking, about two hundred Protestant magistrates to one hundred Catholics; yet not only is the overwhelming majority of the population of the metropolitan county Catholic, but there is in that part of Ireland an unusually large number of well-to-do Catholics who are thoroughly fitted to be magistrates.

OPPOSED TO EVERY REFORM.

We have seen how the Orange party opposed Catholic Emancipation, the reduction of the Protestant Church Establishment, municipal reform, and the Disestablishment of the Church, predicting, as they did, from each one of those reforms “red ruin and the breaking up of laws.” Some of them also opposed the Ballot Bill as “a Popish Bill.” We find in *Saunders’ News Letter* of 5th June, 1871, the following resolution passed at a meeting of the Orange Lodges in Lurgan :—

“That it is now well known that efforts are being made to introduce as the law of this land a system of secret voting (called the ballot), and feeling convinced that such would only tend to advance the interests of Romanism, and at the same time to injure the cause of our common Protestantism, we, the members in lodge assembled, deem it our duty to enter our solemn protest against the measure, and our determination not to support by any means in our power the parliamentary candidate who may declare himself on the side of *this Popish Bill*, as we are sorry to say that Brother Johnston of Ballykilbeg has already done.”

But the most surprising fact, perhaps, in the history of Orangeism is that the Orangemen opposed even Father Mathew's temperance movement in 1841, with language as violent as they are now employing against Mr. Gladstone's Bill. We quote from O'Keeffe's *Life of O'Connell* :—

“ The *Protestant Magazine* for June, 1841, complacently quotes from the congenial *Times* the following awful passage :—‘ We cannot but suspect that this temperance movement is substantially a sort of Trojan horse, within whose ribs there lurks an overwhelming phalanx, which some of these nights will sally on the sleeping sentinels of Ireland and make it an easy prey.’ ”

The same writer states that the following manifesto was published extensively by the Cootehill Orangemen, exhorting the Protestants to oppose the entrance of Father Mathew into their district :—

“ Insulted Protestants, will ye—can ye bear it any longer ? Has the spirit of your fathers and immortal William died within you ? Arouse, be steady and courageous. Let not the religion of your fathers be trampled on by idolaters. Let the spirit of William that whispers to you at this moment animate your hearts and souls, and let not the anti-Christian apostle depart from Cootehill in boasted triumph :—

‘ Arise, I say ; arise, my boys, and raise your standard high ;
The man that will not join you now, treat as an enemy.
Fear not O'Connell, Mathew—devil—but let your motto be,
‘ To put your trust in God, my boys, and keep your powder dry.’
Remember Gideon's chosen few ;
The arm that guarded them, guards you.’ ”

At Loughgall the Orange farmers entered into a resolution not to employ any labourer who would take the temperance pledge—in modern phrase, to “ boycott ” any man who would become a teetotaller !

THE OPPOSITION TO THE NEW FRANCHISE.

It is unnecessary to say that the Orangemen opposed, in the most violent manner, the recent extension of the suffrage in

Ireland ; but it may not be useless to point out that *most, if not all of the districts in which, in the course of their agitation, they held “counter-demonstrations to repel the Nationalist invasion of Loyal Ulster,” fell at the elections in November, 1885, into the hands of the National Party by enormous majorities.*

PART IV.

THE ORANGE PRETENCES.

(1) The Orange minority pretend that they are determined to have “civil war” rather than quietly submit to an Irish Parliament in which they would be amply represented.

The foregoing narrative shows that they have so often made a similar pretence in the past, without even so much as firing a shot afterwards, except in a riot or on the occasion of some Orange celebration, that, apart from the physical impossibility of their maintaining a war for even a single day, the Irish people and the peoples of England and Scotland cannot but regard the “civil war” threatened by them now as a manifest bogey.

As a matter of fact, no sane man in Ireland believes the Orangemen to be in earnest in their threat of civil war. On the contrary, that threat is the subject of general laughter.

Even some of the Orange leaders are themselves beginning to see the absurdity of the threat. The following is an extract from a letter by Colonel Waring, M.P. for one of the divisions of Down, in the *Belfast News-Letter* of 20th May of this year :—

“The great difficulty we experience is to persuade Englishmen that we are in bitter earnest, and all sensational announcements militate against our success in this respect. This matter is much too serious to be passed over in silence by those whose whole energies are being devoted to our great cause. I have, as you know, always held that we might be driven to preserve our birthright by force of arms, and have frequently declared my readiness to do my best in such case ; but our

motto is ‘Defence, not Defiance,’ and when I see that the plan of campaign indicated for the Ulster forces is one which it would tax severely the whole strength of the British Empire to carry out, I can feel no surprise that its announcement calls up a smile of derision on the lips of our enemies, and a blush of confusion to the cheek of sober and sensible friends.”

(2) The Orangemen pretend that they are the very incarnation of loyalty, and they are always talking of their loyalty as constantly as of their “forefathers.”

The foregoing narrative supplies a clear proof that they are loyal only while the British Parliament and Government act as they wish in every particular, and that as often as Parliament has passed Acts—such as the Emancipation Act, the Municipal Reform Act, and the Disestablishment Act—which are now universally admitted to have been measures of the simplest justice to Ireland, but to which they strongly objected—they have threatened to “kick the Crown into the Boyne,” and to “shed their blood to the last drop” in defence of what they called their rights ; and for similar reasons and in similar terms they have attempted to intimidate the House of Commons and threatened England with their vengeance. A curious way of manifesting loyalty !

(3) They pretend that they have all the Protestants of Ireland on their side. As a matter of fact, no persons are more ashamed of or more disgusted with the empty bragging of the Orangemen and their continual efforts to identify Protestantism with their peculiar political creed, than a large number of the Protestants of Ireland, including many who oppose the establishment of an Irish Parliament. These latter will, like all good citizens, submit to an Irish Parliament when it is established, though they oppose Home Rule at present by constitutional means ; while there is still another section of Irish Protestants who are now, and always have been, in favour of a Parliament for Ireland. This last-mentioned fact is evidenced, amongst other things, by the formation of a “Protestant Home Rule Association” in Belfast itself, since the introduction of Mr. Gladstone’s Bill.

In this connection it may be mentioned also, that on the occasion of the visit just paid by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to Kenmare, County of Kerry, he was presented by the Protestant Rector of the parish and thirty or forty of his leading parishioners with an address, in which strong approval was expressed of the Home Rule measure of Mr. Gladstone's Government.

(4) The "Orange minority" pretend they have held Ireland for England.

The fact is just the other way. England has held Ireland for them. England has had to support and maintain them at heavy cost. They have kept her in continual trouble by keeping the Irish people on the verge of insurrection. They took care to render peace and contentment in Ireland impossible. They have prevented the growth of loyalty among the Irish people, and done all in their power to make the emblems, the anthems, and the very name of England hateful to the Irish people.

(5) The Orange party pretend that they are able by reason of their "superior intelligence," "wealth," "education," "courage," "bravery," etc., to dominate, and, if need be, to conquer all Ireland.

There is no foundation whatever for this pretence, as may be seen by reference to Tract "Ulster" of this series. A very liberal calculation would show that they number no more than sixty thousand, all told, out of five millions, and there are only too many proofs that they have neither superior intelligence, nor superior wealth, nor superior courage, nor superior bravery.

The comparative smallness of their numbers was strikingly shown in the agitation against the new Franchise Act in Ulster, when their "counter-demonstrations," or demonstrations in opposition to the Nationalist meetings, were made by persons mainly brought together by the railways from a few Ulster towns, "all expenses paid." Thus Giffin, the Orangeman, who was stabbed by the police in the riotous proceedings at Dromore, in the County Tyrone, was imported for the day from Portadown, in the County of Armagh. The Orange meetings

in fact, in many places in Ulster, consisted of “the same stock company” carried about from “counter-demonstration” to “counter-demonstration,” as occasion required.

A similar difficulty was experienced in 1869, in organising the Anti-Disestablishment meetings ; and one of the expedients resorted to then for the purpose of drawing crowds together, may be gathered from the following intimation in a placard convening a great Protestant meeting in Enniskillen, in July, 1868 : *“The expenses of those who attend the meeting will be allowed to them on their next payment of rent.”*

Moreover, they contradict themselves ; for when they are whining for protection, instead of bragging of their power, they represent themselves as a poor, helpless, shivering, miserable lot, who will inevitably be hunted, persecuted, plundered, and slaughtered, if an Irish Parliament be set up in Dublin. But this description of themselves is also exaggerated.

(6) The Orange party pretend that Irish Protestants would be persecuted under an Irish Parliament.

Such predictions are easily made, and there is no stopping them, for, as Grattan said : “ You cannot argue with a prophet ; you can only disbelieve him.”

In scarcely any part of the world is there any such religious strife and persecution going on as the “loyal minority” pretend to believe would take place Ireland under Home Rule. That sort of thing in this age of the world is impossible, and in Ireland of all places it could not be attempted, for the Irish Catholics, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the people, are the most tolerant and freest from bigotry in the whole world—in spite of the fact that the Orange minority practice, wherever they have power, illiberality of the grossest description.

The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

(1) Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill. By JOHN DILLON, M.P.

(2) The Orange Bogey. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

The Elections of 1885. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P

Coercion. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.

By CHARLES DAWSON, Ex-M.P.

The Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.
By ALFRED WEBB.

Price One Penny each.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms, to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.



Other Tracts in preparation.

NO. 3.

The Irish Question.

THE CHICAGO CONVENTION:

BY

J. E. REDMOND, M.P.

LONDON :
THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.
Price One Penny.

R. D. Webb and Son, Printers,
74 Abbey-street, Dublin.

THE CHICAGO CONVENTION.

P A R T I.

WHAT THE CONVENTION DID.

THE Convention of the Irish race in America, which assembled in Chicago on the 18th August, 1886, has attracted so much attention in England, and has been the subject of so much misrepresentation by the enemies of Ireland, that it is desirable that its character, spirit, and work, should be clearly made known to the public.

We will first state what the Convention really did, and then what it did not do.

NUMBER OF DELEGATES.

The total number of delegates who assembled was 972—almost every State and Territory in the American Union being represented; and an evidence of the growth of the movement was supplied by the presence, in addition, of a delegation from each of the provinces of Canada.

The following is the official list of delegates:—

Alabama,	3	Tennessee,	23
California,	11	Rhode Island,	8
Colorado,	2	Wisconsin,	58
Connecticut,	11	Kansas,	2
Delaware,	4	Illinois,	78
Georgia,	10	Nebraska,	11
Indiana,	22	New Jersey,	25
Kentucky,	14	Pennsylvania,	114
Ohio,	18	Iowa,	66
Maryland,	17	Ontario,	17
District of Columbia,	13	Quebec,	7
New Hampshire,	1	Louisiana,	75
Montana Territory,	6	Texas,	9
Vermont,	1	Virginia,	1
Florida,	1	Massachusetts,	48
New York,	160	Missouri,	27
Michigan,	69				
Minnesota,	12	Total,	972

No man who knows anything of the facts will venture to deny that this was a representation of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people in North America. Many of the branches represented numbered thousands of enrolled members.

THE COMMITTEES AND RESOLUTIONS.

Committees, consisting of one representative chosen by each state delegation, were appointed to deal with :—(1) Resolutions ; (2) Permanent Organization ; (3) Finance ; and (4) Constitution.

The Irish delegates, namely, Mr. Michael Davitt, Mr. Wm. O'Brien, Mr. J. E. Redmond, M.P., and Mr. John Deasy, M.P., were elected as honorary members of “the Committee on Resolutions ;” but they took no part whatever in framing the resolutions adopted.

The resolutions recommended to the Convention by this Committee were adopted unanimously, and are as follows :—

“We, the delegates of the Irish National League of America, in convention assembled, firmly believing in the principles of human freedom, and in the right of a people to frame their own laws—a right which lies at the foundation of the prosperity and greatness of this Republic, and *which has been advantageously extended to the colonial possessions of Great Britain*—do hereby resolve :—

“1. That we express our heartiest and most unqualified approval of national self-government for Ireland.

“2. That we heartily approve of the course pursued by Charles Stewart Parnell and his Parliamentary associates in the English House of Commons ; and we renew the expression of entire confidence in their wisdom, and in their ability to achieve Home Rule in Ireland.

“3. That we extend our heartfelt thanks to Mr. Gladstone for his great efforts in behalf of Irish self-government, and we express our gratitude to the English, Scotch, and Welsh democracy, for the support given to the great Liberal Leader and his Irish policy, during the recent general elections.

“4. That this Convention hereby returns its thanks to the American people and press, for the generous support which they have given to the cause of self-government in Ireland.

“5. That we record our sense of the remarkable forbearance and self-restraint exercised by our people in Ireland, in the face of the cruel and

dishonest system of extortion to which they are being subjected by rack-renting landlords ; and in view of the licence scandalously extended to organized lawlessness in the North of Ireland by partisan officials ; and we commend the laudable desire of the people of Ireland to manage their own affairs in their own way.

“6. That we hereby thank the President, Treasurer, and Secretary of the Irish National League, for the faithful and efficient manner in which they have discharged the arduous duties of their respective situations.

“7. That the following cablegram be forwarded, in the name of the Chairman of the Convention, to the Hon. Charles Stewart Parnell :—

““ Delegates to the Irish National League Convention of America send greeting from our body, which embraces representative citizens from every State and Territory in the Union, and also from Canada, and assure you of a cordial endorsement of your policy by a united and harmonious Convention.””

The significance of those declarations, which, indeed, is self-evident, we shall point out further on.

THE BALANCE SHEET.

The Rev. Dr. O'Reilly, of Detroit, Michigan, the Honorary Treasurer of the Irish National League of America, then submitted his balance sheet, which was passed and adopted, and which was as follows :—

PARLIAMENTARY FUND.

Cash on hand reported to Boston Convention,	\$4,739
Cash received at Boston Convention,	1,111
Interest on deposit,	175
Receipts from all other sources,	314,257
Total,	\$320,282
Transmitted to C. S. Parnell and Trustees of the Parliamentary Fund,	314,452
Balance on hand,	\$5,830

LEAGUE FUND.

Cash on hand reported at Boston Convention,	\$4,731
Cash received at Boston Convention,	3,562
Cash guaranteed at Boston Convention,	200
Received from Branches,	21,741
Received from donations,	904
Received from Patrick Egan (salary returned),	3,000
Total,	\$34,138
Transmitted to Mr. William O'Brien, Ireland,	4,847
Guarantee unpaid,	200
Expense Treasurer's office (two years),	1,527
Expense Secretary's office (two years),	2,897
General expenses,	3,752
Expense of two organizers,	1,859
Patrick Egan, one year's salary	3,000
Total,	\$18,082
Balance on hand,	\$16,056

Those figures also tell their own tale. They show that the sympathy of the Irish in America with the political and social movement of the Irish people in Ireland, is no mere lip-sympathy, but is a deep and abiding sentiment, which finds expression in a form which even the most sceptical cannot ridicule.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

The election of officers for the coming year was next proceeded with; and Mr. John Fitzgerald, of Lincoln, Nebraska, was chosen President; the Rev. Dr. O'Reilly, Detroit, Michigan, Treasurer; and Mr. John P. Sutton, Secretary.

The *Chicago Tribune*, one of the leading American (not Irish-American) journals of the United States, thus describes the new President of the League in America :—

“ Mr. John Fitzgerald, the new President, was born near Glin, a romantic little town, famous in the days of the Desmonds, in the western part of Limerick County, Ireland, about fifty-five years ago, and came to

America fifteen or sixteen years later. He sought in Wisconsin and Minnesota for the land where manly toil surely reaps the crop it sows, and, without unnecessary delay, set himself to the hard work which usually falls to the hands of the unfriended immigrant. He was a lad of energy and push. Railroad building was the principal occupation of the newly arrived Irishman. He laid ties and rails at the current daily wages for a few months, advanced to the position of foreman before he was out of his teens, and was a contractor for building railroads when he had attained his majority. His success was remarkable. He built a large portion of the North-Western Road and its branches, and later laid many miles of track and ties of the Union Pacific. At this time he resided in Wisconsin. As the Pacific Road advanced westward, he moved to Nebraska, where he began to experiment as a farmer and cattle raiser with profit and advantage. He continued in his business as contractor, however, and growing rich of course, became a banker. He is now president of the First National Bank of Lincoln, also president of a bank at Plattsmouth. He owns several extensive farms at Minnesota, Nebraska, and Colorado, and three or four herds of fancy cattle, and has a couple of well-stocked ranches besides. He is reputed to be worth 5,000,000 dollars—the reward of close attention to business, and careful industry. In politics he is a Democrat of the old school, and was a delegate-at-large from his State to the Democratic National Convention two years ago. He has been connected with all the Irish patriotic movements in this country since he attained to manhood. He is an ardent disciple of Father Mathew."

In a word, Mr. Fitzgerald is a specimen of the highest type of American citizen—a man who is a credit equally to the land of his birth and to that of his adoption. His latest act as President, has been to subscribe out of his own private purse the sum of three thousand dollars to the Evicted Tenants' Relief Fund.

PART II.

WHAT THE CONVENTION DID NOT DO.

As soon as the enemies of the Irish cause found that the Convention had signally disappointed their sinister predictions of

internal dissensions, they sedulously set to work to misrepresent what it actually did, and to distort and garble what the Irish delegates and others said in their speeches. The accusations against the Convention which have appeared—some of them in the London newspapers, some of them in the speeches of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Hartington in the last session of parliament—may fairly be stated as follows :—

1. That the Convention did not thoroughly endorse Mr. Parnell's action and accept Mr. Gladstone's Bill.
2. That "a strike against rent" was proclaimed at the Convention ; and
3. That it urged the adoption of a more advanced policy generally on the Irish party.

These statements we shall deal with separately.

DID THE CONVENTION DECLINE TO ACCEPT MR. GLADSTONE'S BILL ?

The answer to this question is supplied by the resolutions already quoted. The Convention, in the preamble to the resolution, defined beyond all possibility of doubt the kind of settlement of the Irish question which they would accept. They say :—"We, the delegates of the Irish National League of America, in Convention assembled, firmly believing in the principles of human freedom, and in *the right of a people to frame their own laws*, a right which lies at the foundation of the prosperity and greatness of this Republic, and *which has been advantageously extended to the colonial possessions of Great Britain*, do hereby resolve," etc.

So that, so far from making a claim for separation, the Convention distinctly asked for Ireland only such a right of "framing her own laws" as has been "advantageously extended to the Colonial possessions of Great Britain."

The Convention then proceeded to "heartily approve of the course pursued by Charles Stewart Parnell and his parliamentary associates in the English House of Commons." That course, as all the world knows, included the acceptance by the Irish Par-

liamentary Party and its chief, in the name of the Irish race throughout the world, of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, as a final settlement of the Irish question.

As if to make its position still more clear, the Convention next proceeded to express its "heartfelt thanks to Mr. Gladstone, for his great efforts on behalf of Irish self-government," and to express their "gratitude to the English, Scotch, and Welsh democracies, for the support given to the great Liberal leader and his Irish policy during the recent general elections."

So far as the resolutions go, it is therefore clear that the *Convention endorsed the attitude towards Mr. Gladstone's bill, which the Irish Parliamentary Party from the first maintained.* When we consider the feeling of bitter hatred to English rule which the Irish in America have ever entertained, this fact constitutes the most remarkable proof that has yet been given of the wonderful change in the feelings of Irishmen in general wrought by Mr. Gladstone's generous and noble policy.

Judge Fitzgerald, of Cincinnati, ex-Speaker of the Ohio Parliament, who was Chairman of the Convention, spoke as follows :—

" We hate England, because she has hated, and robbed, and plundered our nation and our people (applause). And when the day of hate ceases, there are no people on earth whose hearts are more ready to forgive than Irish hearts (applause). When they give us even a stinted measure of rights for our people, then and not till then shall we cease hating the tyrants (cheers). Look at the generous hearts of our people throughout the land, in their expressions of gratitude to the greatest, noblest living English statesman (applause). The people of our land—the American citizens—thank him and those behind him (cheers). To the people of Scotland and Wales, who came up nobly in that last election, and said that the Irish people were entitled to the God-given right of fixing their own domestic affairs and legislating on matters purely personal to them—to them everywhere millions of hearts should go out in thankful remembrance (applause). And to the democracy of England, who are willing, even at this late day, to give our people a stinted measure of justice, we all extend our heartfelt thanks " (applause).

This, assuredly, was the language of a frank and honest man.

Mr. William O'Brien, in one of his speeches, put the point plainly to the assembly. He said :—

“ You in America hold the fate of our cause in the hollow of your hands. That tremendous power of yours involves a tremendous responsibility. It is of supreme importance that our position should be made clear beyond the possibility of misrepresentation. It would be cowardly and false on our part to forget that we have now friends as well as enemies in England. There are 1,500,000 of English workingmen, who have registered their votes in favour of an Irish Parliament in College Green. There is one great Englishman who is worth another 1,500,000. We told Mr. Gladstone—we told all Englishmen, that if they reached out an honest hand of friendship to Ireland they would not reach it out in vain. We were perfectly frank with them. We told them candidly, that to English rule in Ireland we are and will for ever remain irreconcileable ; and until they can exterminate the last man of our race, they will never have rest nor peace, until the hopes that have lived through seven centuries, shall have blossomed at last over our land. But we told them also that our quarrel with England was bounded by her rule within the four shores of Ireland. We told them that upon the day when the working millions of England, by their votes and of their own free will, hauled down the flag of English domination in Ireland, the hatreds and passions which have raged for ages between the two countries would subside. We ventured to promise that, for you as well as for our people at home, and standing here in the presence of this great representative gathering of Irish-Americans, who would be only too proud to shed their heart's blood in the cause of Ireland on the battlefield, I am not afraid to repeat that promise in your name. If we are wrong in that, we are wrong in everything ; for it is the root and the essence of our movement, that it is possible to conciliate Ireland without injuring England. We have promised for you, and you have promised for yourselves. The resolutions of the Convention are a message to all the world, that peace and friendship were within the grasp of England, if she had been as wise and bold as Mr. Gladstone ; aye, and that peace and friendship are within her grasp even yet, upon the day when she once more enthrones Mr. Gladstone in power, and commissions him to conclude his treaty of peace with the Irish nation.”

Mr. O'Brien, when he spoke in the House of Commons in support of Mr. Gladstone's bill, and uttered practically the same opinions as he expressed at Chicago, was challenged by the then

Tory leader of the House of Commons, now the Chief Secretary for Ireland, to repeat his speech outside Parliament. It is to be hoped that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach will take an early opportunity of admitting that his challenge has been accepted, and of stating the result.

Mr. J. E. Redmond, M.P., spoke in the same strain. He said :—

“ The one great principle of any settlement of the Irish question, must be the recognition of the divine right of Irishmen, and Irishmen alone, to rule Ireland. This is the principle in support of which you are assembled here to-day ; this is the principle which guides our movement in Ireland. But consistently with that principle we believe it is possible to bring about a settlement honorable to England and Ireland alike—whereby the wrongs and miseries of the past may be forgotten ; whereby the chapter of English wrongs and Irish resistance may be closed ; and whereby a future of freedom *and of unity between the two nations* may be inaugurated. *Such a settlement, we believe, was offered to us by Mr. Gladstone* ; and, quite apart from the increased strength which Mr. Gladstone’s proposals, even though temporarily defeated, have given to our cause, we have, I think, reason to rejoice at the opportunity which they have afforded to our suffering and exasperated people, to show the magnanimity of their natures, and the unalloyed purity of their love of liberty. What a spectacle Ireland afforded to the world, when at last one great Englishman arose bold and wise enough to do justice to her character. Ages of heartless oppression and bitter wrong—hundreds of thousands of martyrs to Irish freedom—ages of stupid religious persecution—ages of depopulation and State-created famine—never-ending insult and ruthless calumny—all in that one moment were forgotten, and the feelings uppermost in the hearts of the Irish race, at home and abroad, were—gratitude to the aged statesman who simply proposed to do justice, and anxiety for a ‘blessed oblivion of the past.’ Who, in the face of the reception given to the bill of Mr. Gladstone, cramped and deformed as it was by humiliating safeguards and unnecessary limitations, will dare to say that the principle of our movement is merely race hatred to England ? No. Last April, Ireland was ready to forget and forgive. She was ready to sacrifice many things for peace, so long as the one essential principle for which she struggled was conceded (applause). She was willing, on the day when the portals of her ancient Senate House were

re-opened, to shake hands with her hereditary foe, and to proclaim peace between the democracies of the two nations, whom the Almighty had placed side by side to be friends, but who had been kept apart by the avarice, the passions, and the injustice of a few (applause). What centuries of oppression had failed to do, seemed about to be accomplished by one word of conciliation, by one act of justice."

Mr. Michael Davitt, Mr. John Deasy, M.P., and, in fact, all the speakers at the Convention, spoke in the same spirit, amid universal applause. Both by formal resolution, and by the voices of all who spoke, therefore, the Convention, composed of the bitterest enemies of English rule in Ireland, enthusiastically accepted Mr. Gladstone's bill as a treaty, on the basis of which an honorable and permanent peace might be established between England and Ireland. This great fact cannot be denied, though unscrupulous efforts have been made to obscure it.

WAS "A STRIKE AGAINST RENT" PROCLAIMED AT THE CONVENTION?

The statement that "a strike against rent" was proclaimed at the Convention, has been made by Lord Hartington in the House of Commons, and by *The Times* newspaper. It is utterly devoid of truth. The agrarian question was, in fact, but little alluded to at Chicago.

The resolutions, so far from advocating a "no-rent policy," recorded the approval by the Convention of "the remarkable forbearance and self-restraint exercised by our people in Ireland, in the face of the cruel and dishonest system of extortion to which they are subjected by rack-renting landlords." The speeches made at the Convention no more proclaimed "a strike against rent," than did those in the recent debate in the House of Commons, in which it was pointed out, that owing to the fall in prices, the full judicial rent in many cases had become excessive and impossible.

Lord Hartington specifically accused Mr. J. E. Redmond, M.P., with having advocated a "no-rent" policy at the Convention.

The accusation is grounded upon the following passages from his speech :—

“ In the coming Winter, the laws of nature itself will forbid the possibility of peace. For the last six months, the tenant-farmers of Ireland have played a part too little known and appreciated here. They submitted to untold privations, and sufferings, and exactions, in patience and in silence, lest by one word or act of theirs they should embarrass their leaders in Parliament, or retard by one moment the concession of Home Rule. The landlords of Ireland noted, but totally misunderstood the meaning of the change of attitude. They mistook forbearance and patriotism for cowardice, and the crowbar brigade once more set to work.

“ Still the tenants suffered in silence. Mr. Gladstone proposed a land bill which would have bought out the landlords at an extravagantly high figure, yet the Irish tenants were ready, because it was coupled with the concession of Home Rule, to pay this exorbitant sum as the price to be paid for National freedom. Once more Irish landlords have behaved with unaccountable folly and stupidity. They have once more stood between Ireland and her freedom; and have refused even an extravagant price for their land, because the offer was coupled with the concession of an Irish Parliament. So be it. I believe the last offer has been made to Irish landlordism. The ultimate settlement of this question must now be reserved for the Parliament of Ireland, and meantime the people must take care to protect themselves and their children. *In many parts of Ireland, I assert, rent is to-day an impossibility, and in every part of Ireland the rents demanded are exorbitant, and cannot be paid.*”

The words printed in italics are those relied on to substantiate the charge of having preached a “ no rent policy.” It would, however, be interesting to compare the statement, that “in many parts of Ireland rent is to-day an impossibility,” with the statement made last March by *The Times*, on the authority of Sir James Caird, that “on 538,000 holdings in Ireland, rented at £3,572,000 per annum, the rent is practically irrecoverable by anybody, whether landlord, English Government, or Irish Government.” It would be equally interesting to inquire how the statement, that in many parts of Ireland “the rents demanded are exorbitant and cannot be paid,” is untrue, in view of the recent

statement by Mr. Giffen—that the prices of all kinds of farm produce in Ireland, have within the last eighteen months, *i.e.*, since these rents were fixed, fallen on an average about 20 per cent. No strike against rent was proclaimed at Chicago ; but the plain undisputed fact was pointed out, that the payment in full of the old rent had in many cases become impossible. In how many cases it has become impossible is the question. Neither Mr. Redmond, nor any other member of the Irish Party, or representative of the Irish tenantry, has ventured to go so far as Sir James Caird or *The Times* newspaper. But the question would have been determined by Mr. Parnell's Tenants' Bill.

DID THE CONVENTION URGE ANY NEW POLICY UPON MR. PARNELL ?

The attitude of Irish-Americans upon this point was repeatedly emphasized. Judge Fitzgerald opened the proceedings with the following remarkable statement :—

“It has been mooted along in some dark corners, that a resolution will be presented here to-day, dictating a policy to those directly interested in the objects of this Convention. There may be a mad-house not far from here—[cheers and laughter]—and there may be an escaped lunatic from that house. But, lunatic or not, no matter who he may be, if such a man should dare to show his brazen head in this Convention, and should for one moment dictate or suggest a policy to Parnell and the Irish Parliamentary Party, I anticipate that your serjeant-at-arms could not prevent this multitude of good and true men from rising in their might and ejecting the crazy fellow (cheers). I promise you, Sirs [meaning the delegates from Ireland], that from this Convention there shall emanate but one sentiment, but one action, and that is for Ireland—to follow in your wake, not to direct, not to dictate, not to suggest.”

Mr. J. E. Redmond, M.P., on behalf of the leaders at home, made it perfectly clear that no attempt at dictation from America would be successful, even were it made. He said :—

“Well, but for the future, what is the policy, and who are to be the framers of that policy ? Here I come to the second point I mentioned at the beginning—namely, the condition upon which alone we can value your confidence or accept your support. So long as we are true to the great principle of Irish nationality, resolutely refusing either to be bought

or coerced from a rigid adherence to the full measure of national right, and so long as we are able to point to our past policy as honest and successful, we say we and no others are entitled to decide for ourselves upon Irish soil, and upon our own responsibility, what our policy for the future is to be (applause). This is the condition upon which you have given your support to us in the past, and it is the condition upon which alone we can accept your support for the future."

In the face of a declaration like this, to pretend for a moment that the Convention urged on Mr. Parnell and the Irish Parliamentary Party, a more "advanced" or "extreme" policy than they had publicly pledged themselves to in the House of Commons, is an impudent and a malicious, as well as a weak invention of the enemy.

SUMMING UP.

To sum up this part, it is indisputable that:—

(1) The Convention recognized in Mr. Gladstone's bill an honest attempt to settle upon an honourable and satisfactory basis the relations between England and Ireland.

(2) It tendered to Mr. Gladstone, and the English, Scotch and Welsh democracy, its heartfelt thanks, and recognized the fact, that henceforth, not the people of Great Britain, but only a small portion of the people of England, are to be regarded as the enemies of Ireland.

(3) It assured Mr. Parnell of its approval of his past action in Parliament in accepting Mr. Gladstone's bill, and generally.

(4) So far from proclaiming a new no-rent policy for Ireland, it specifically disclaimed all right or desire to dictate, or even suggest, any line of action whatever to the leaders of the movement at home.

PART III.

THE FINERTY INCIDENT.

There was one man in the Convention who refused to acquiesce in the resolutions adopted ; and the utterances of this one individual have received more attention from a section of the British press, than the declarations of the remaining 971 delegates all put together. The reason is not far to seek. The Convention emphatically and boldly endorsed the attitude towards Mr. Gladstone's bill which Mr. Parnell had adopted. Mr. John Finerty, on the contrary, openly declared that *he* would never accept that bill as a final settlement ; and the enemies of Home Rule and Mr. Gladstone instantly seized upon his declaration, as the only crumb of comfort to be obtained from proceedings, to which they had looked forward with so much hope and confidence. The truth is, Mr. Finerty's declaration was regarded with very little concern by the Convention. Everyone who knew anything of his past utterances was perfectly aware of his opinions, and it ought in fairness to him to be stated, that he made no attempt whatever, in his speech, to commit the other delegates to any approval of his statements. He had been chosen as a member of the committee on resolutions ; but so convinced was he that he would be out of sympathy with all the other members, that he refused to act upon it. *He kept his peculiar views to himself until the entire proceedings of the Convention were over, and when he did speak he repeatedly stated that he spoke only for himself.*

The gist of Mr. Finerty's speech is contained in the following extract from it :—

“I am not opposed to Parnell ; but he cannot get me to subscribe to the policy—that Gladstone's Home Rule bill is to be accepted as a final settlement of all Ireland's troubles. I did not vote for your platform. The moment you bow your heads or lower your flag, the English will despise you.”

The moment he resumed his seat, Mr. Davitt rose, and amid universal applause, spoke as follows :—

“ He regretted that he had to intrude again upon their attention, but he could not, representing the men at home as he did, with his colleagues, allow Mr. Finerty’s speech to go without a few words of reply. He had come from the people of Ireland with his colleagues, to represent the movement which was endeavouring, by peaceful and constitutional means, to work out the principle of Irish national self-government (cheers). He would be false to his mission, and the principles of that movement—he would be betraying the trust reposed in him by Mr. Parnell and the people of Ireland—if he did not make this protest against the speech which had been delivered by Mr. Finerty. The movement had been sneered at by their enemies on the other side of the water, and Mr. Finerty found fault with its methods. The movement was peaceable. Resting upon moral force as it did, would not Mr. Finerty admit that Ireland had been elevated into a position which she had never occupied before? (cheers).

“ **MR. FINERTY.**—I never denied it.

“ **MR. DAVITT** said, by their policy they had won the sympathy of the American people (cheers). They had succeeded in converting even those who were heretofore their enemies, and convinced 2,000,000 of the British people that their struggle was right, and their sympathy had been extended to them in their effort to make the struggle successful (applause). Surely if the movement had accomplished so much in a short time, it was capable, when represented by true men, of doing in a short time what they all wished to do for their native land—(cheers)—to win for Ireland the right, and dignity, and position of a nation (applause). The Convention had approved of their platform and their principles—had sent resolutions across the Atlantic, pledging support on present lines, and promising material assistance in the near future. He only wanted this decision guarded, so that no other decision contrary to it should follow that message, to discourage the people of Ireland and give satisfaction to the enemies of the Irish cause (cheers). He had as much respect for John Finerty as ever, and believed him to be as honest an Irishman as lived in America. His policy and his methods he would not pass sentence upon. They had had their trial. They had not succeeded in winning Irish freedom.

“ **Mr. FINERTY.**—Neither has yours.

“ **MR. DAVITT** claimed that the present policy had advanced the cause more in seven years than it had progressed in the last fifty years (cheers and cries of ‘You are right’). He asked that they be not embarrassed in their work—that they forbear with them on peaceful and constitutional lines. This was not an unreasonable request, when they thought

that 4,000,000 in Ireland, and 19 out of every 20 of the race in America, endorsed the movement, approved the policy, and supported the leader" (cheers).

Mr. Redmond also replied to Mr. Finerty. He said :—

"As Mr. Finerty's speech was certain to be quoted by the enemy through the English press, it was only right he should say something, especially as his speech was referred to by Mr. Finerty. I feel it my duty [continued Mr. Redmond] to say one word in this matter, and it will be a word of perfect good humour. Mr. Finerty did not do justice to my remarks, if he said they were in advance of the resolutions of the Convention. It is those resolutions, and nothing else, which will go forth to the world as the expression of this Convention. The opinions of this Convention are expressed in the records, and Mr. Finerty spoke here after the deliberative work of the Convention was over, and did not express anything but his own opinions, and they could not therefore go forth as identified with the Convention. I have only risen—in fairness to my colleagues on this platform and abroad—in fairness to myself, and to state, that my remarks to-day were in close keeping with the resolutions, and to state that Mr. Finerty was not speaking for the Convention."

In the face of these facts and these declarations, it will be seen how dishonest and absurd is the attempt to prove, that, because Mr. Finerty dissented from the resolutions, therefore the Convention which, with the single exception of himself, unanimously adopted these resolutions, did not believe in them.

On this point, Mr. William O'Brien, speaking at a meeting of the National League in Dublin, a few days after his return from America, said :—

"Those resolutions were, practically speaking, unanimously adopted by that great Convention, with the single exception of Mr. Finerty, who stated his own opinions on the matter. They were, practically speaking, unanimously adopted by what they call a 'rising vote,' every man upon his feet cheering. Of course it is always possible, even after all that, for Mr. Chamberlain and for *The Times* to say that the Convention said one thing and that they meant another. Of course it is always possible to treat us as if we were a nation of liars and hypocrites. All I can say is, that I wish Mr. Chamberlain or any other man alive, had attempted to induce that Convention, for policy's sake or prudence's sake, or expedience, or any other consideration under the sun—had at-

tempted to force or cajole them into swallowing a single resolution or a syllable that they believed in the slightest degree derogatory to Irish nationality, or to anything like lowering the flag. The man who tried it would be a bolder man than the man that swam down the Niagara rapids the day we were in that neighbourhood."

Colonel Atkinson of Detroit, at the great mass meeting held in Chicago, the night after the Convention, spoke as follows :—

" This meeting he considered a sort of ratification of the action of the Convention. As a member of the Committee on Resolutions, he could say that there was no division of opinion, and no reading between the lines in the resolutions, but a plain statement of facts. The gentlemen from Ireland, who were made members of the committee, had refused to draft a single resolution, but had left all to the judgment of their brethren on this side of the water."

The Finerty incident then simply amounted to this: that in an assembly consisting of 972 delegates, one individual alone dissented from the resolutions adopted; and in order that his opinions should be clearly understood, claimed and obtained the right to explain, that he did not believe in Mr. Gladstone's bill as a final settlement, and would not pin his faith, under all circumstances, to peaceable methods. *Lest these sentiments should be held to compromise the Convention, they were at once, and amid universal applause, repudiated by Mr. Davitt, Mr. Redmond, and others.* This incident, indeed, so far from detracting from the value of the support tendered to Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gladstone, ought, on the contrary, to enhance it, by emphasizing what was an unexpectedly cordial and unanimous acceptance of a policy of peace and friendship by a body of men who, before the introduction of the Home Rule bill, were bitter and apparently implacable enemies of England.

PART IV.

AMERICAN SYMPATHY.

The Convention was the means of eliciting a most remarkable expression of sympathy with Ireland from Americans of all American political parties.

The night after the Convention closed its proceedings, a mass meeting of the citizens of Chicago was held, to discuss the Irish question. The Republican Governor of the State of Illinois, Governor Oglesby, was among the speakers ; and so was the Hon. Samuel J. Randall, a member of Congress, one of the leaders of the Democratic party, and for some time Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington. In the course of an eloquent speech, Mr. Randall said :—

“ No cause like this can go down. We must succeed. We will win. You need have to fear. The end, I trust, is nearly reached when freedom, liberty, and self-government will control in Ireland. And now in conclusion, I want to say—give these men good cheer—give them to understand that we have not abated in any degree in the cause that they are engaged in, and let them go back to the Grand Old Man, that hero and statesman, Mr. Gladstone, and tell him that American enlightenment of the nineteenth century presents a united voice in approval of the course that he has pursued. He is a Grand Old Man, the greatest, in my judgment, that has existed during my period. He was equal to the occasion. He has suffered, as the American colonies suffered, temporary defeat. But the defeat will bring him, as it brought finally the American colonies, a united people even in England, in the direction that he has pointed out. Never was a more truthful word said, than when he declared that the issue of the present time in Great Britain was between the masses and classes. And let me say that there has come, and there is in this country to-day, a better feeling towards the English people, than ever before since our Revolutionary War, because the English masses to-day, so far as they can, have determined to give free government to Ireland.”

The entire American Press, in its comments on the Convention, showed itself to be on the side of Ireland, and heartily supported Mr. Gladstone’s policy. We give a few illustrative extracts from

a few of the leading organs of public opinion, not one of them being Irish :—

From *The Detroit Evening News.*

“The Convention, as a whole, was an honour to the race which it represented, an honour to the cause which it seeks to elevate, and an honour to the adopted country of its delegates.”

From *The New York Herald.*

“It had been predicted that the Convention would disagree. But the dictum of a body that comes as near to being an Irish parliament as any body at this time can be, goes out to the world with the force of unqualified unanimity.”

From *The New York Morning Journal.*

“The Chicago Convention of the National League has produced a glorious moral effect. It has inspired with courage the despondent hearts of Irishmen at home who behold in Tory rule a coming repetition of the old, weary, grinding oppression. It has nerved the Parnellites, cheered the iron heart of the Grand Old Man, and proved to the enemies of Ireland that a solid phalanx guards the rere.”

From *The Chicago Tribune.*

“The people of Ireland, and their leaders both in Ireland and America, are to be congratulated on the happy outcome of this most representative and harmonious convention. The delegates proved themselves worthy of the trust confided in them. They have been self-restrained, prudent, and loyal to Parnell, and his greatly, Mr. Gladstone. The proceedings are ample evidence of the Irish capacity for self-government.”

From *The Philadelphia Press.*

“The League Convention at Chicago has confounded the enemies and encouraged the friends of Home Rule in Ireland. It has proved to be an imposing, temperate, harmonious, and successful assembly. It has spoken the voice, and fixed the attitude of the great body of Irish-Americans, with a moderation, clearness and firmness, that will strengthen the cause of Irish self-government, and uphold the hands of their compatriots who are leading the struggle in Parliament. Ranking among the largest and most important gatherings, the Irish-Americans have ever held its discreet counsels, its reasonable tone, and its prudent action, will exert a potent and wholesome influence on both sides of the sea.

“ The enemies of Home Rule counted upon dissensions and conflicts. They had hoped for divisions and for declarations, which would embarrass Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gladstone, in their legitimate and constitutional struggle for the establishment of Irish rights. In all these expectations they were completely disappointed. The resolutions are distinguished for their calm, dignified, and moderate tone. They express the strongest devotion to national self-government for Ireland, unqualified confidence in Mr. Parnell and his associates, gratitude to Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal masses of England, Scotland, and Wales, and just sense of the forbearance, self-restraint, and patient purpose of the people of Ireland.”

From *The Philadelphia Record.*

“ If there be any people who still lay the flattering unction to their souls, that Irishmen are unfitted to exercise the right of self-government, they should certainly have their minds disabused of that idea, after reading the account of yesterday’s proceedings of the Irish National League Convention at Chicago. It is questionable if, with the temptations held out, with the smouldering feeling of resentment in so many hearts, and the favourable character of the environment for the expression of the most radical ideas, any deliberative body in Christendom could have shown more wisdom, or better fulfilled the expectations of those who were watching its course so earnestly. The resolutions which were adopted, while breathing a spirit of independence, carry with them neither threat nor defiance. Starting with the principle of national self-government as their foundation, they recognize the legitimate efforts which have been made to bring this about for Ireland, and pledge the support of the League to Mr. Parnell, in the policy which he has carried on so successfully, and which he has determined to continue. There is no denunciation of men or methods, no dragging in of personal grievances or animosities, but an eloquent presentation of the aims and ends of all true Irishmen—eloquent if for nothing else, but its manly straightforwardness and simplicity. It is difficult to see how even the most rabid of the English press can speak of such a deliverance except in the spirit of commendation, especially as it simply echoes the voice of one million of the English democracy, as expressed at the polls.”

Assuredly, Mr. Gladstone was well within the truth, when he claimed that his Home Rule policy had the support of the civilized world.



The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) **Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill.** By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) **The Orange Bogey.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) **The Chicago Convention.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (4) **The Irish Land Crisis.**
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (5) **The "Castle" System.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (6) **The Truth about '98.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (7) **Irish Industries and English Legislation.**
By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (8) **The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.**
By CHARLES DAWSON, Ex-M.P.
- (9) **An Irish Judge on the Irish Question.**
With Introduction by J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (10) **Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.**
By ALFRED WEBB.
Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
The Elections of 1885. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
Coercion. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
Price One Penny each.

A Word for Ireland. By T. M. HEALY, B.L. Price 1s.
Report on the Present State of the Irish Land Question.
By A LAND VALUER. Price 6d.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms, to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.



Other Tracts in preparation.

NO. 4.

The Irish Question.

THE LAND CRISIS:

BY

PIERCE MAHONY,

M. P. for North Meath,

AND

JOHN J. CLANCY, M.A.

M. P. for North Dublin.

LONDON:

THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

Price One Penny.

R. D. Webb and Son, Printers,
74 Abbey-street, Dublin.

THE IRISH LAND CRISIS.

THE FALL IN PRICES.

THE case for a reduction of the judicial rents fixed before 1885, when the recent great fall in prices commenced, rests mainly on the fact of that fall.

It has been said that the Land Commissioners, in fixing the rents, took into consideration the possibility of such a fall in prices and allowed for it. We have express evidence—from one of themselves—that they did nothing of the sort.

Mr. Pierce Mahony, M.P., who acted as a Sub-Commissioner for three years previous to 1885, stated in the House of Commons, on 24th August, in the present year, that the judicial rents were based mainly on prices existing from 1879 to 1884; that the Commissioners had no other basis to go upon; and that if, as had been suggested, they had been influenced by the prices existing for the six years before 1879, the only effect must have been to make them adopt a higher standard of rent, since those prices were much higher than those subsequently prevailing. Mr. Mahony added that the Commissioners believed the period of depression was at an end, and judging by past history, was not likely to return for a considerable time, and that before it returned, there would be a period of prosperity, which would enable farmers to put by sufficient savings to tide them over a bad year or two. The question, then, that remains is, whether the Commissioners have proved to be wrong in their forecast. The answer can only be, that they erred egregiously.

Instead of a return to prosperity, we have had a depression more acute than ever. Prices in '85, as compared with prices in

the six previous years, fell very low, and this depression has continued and become aggravated in '86. This is perfectly notorious, and cannot be denied. The following are the figures :—

	Prices for six years ending 1884.			Prices for 1885.			Percentage, fall or rise.	
	s.	d.		s.	d.		per cent. fall.	rise.
Wheat per cwt.	...	9	5	...	8	6	...	9·7
Oats,	...	7	7	...	8	0	...	5·2
Barley,	...	7	9	...	7	5	...	4·3
Flax,	...	59	10	...	55	0	...	8·0
Butter,	...	103	6	...	75	6	...	27·0
Beef,	...	67	0	...	56	6	...	15·6
Pork,	...	54	7	...	43	6	...	20·3
Mutton,	...	79	0	...	65	5	...	18·4
Wool per lb.	...	0	11	...	0	8	...	27·0
Milch Cows,	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
	19	0	0	15	10	0	...	18·0
Two-year old stock,	...	12	10	0	10	0	...	20·0
One-year old stock,	...	8	0	0	6	5	0	...
							22·0	„ „

The price of butter for '85 (here given) differs from that given by Mr. Villiers Stuart ; but it is carefully averaged from the prices for each month of '85, as given in *The Irish Farmers' Gazette*, which is *not* a Nationalist newspaper ; and it coincides with the price given by the landlords' organization.

It is true that the price of oats has risen 5d. per cwt. in '85, compared with the prices of the past six years. But in practice it is not found to be a very profitable crop, because the acreage devoted to it has been steadily decreasing year by year since 1882 ; and there are now 74,102 acres less under this crop than in 1882. In addition to this, it is not a crop which influences largely the rent-paying capabilities of Irish tenants, because out of a total acreage of 15,211,175 of cultivable land, only 1,323,205 acres are given up to the oat crop, or very little more than one-fifteenth part of the whole.

Those figures, it is submitted, settle the question. In face of them it is simply impossible to contend that rents confessedly fixed on the basis of prices for the six years ending '84, can be fair, now that prices have fallen so greatly.

ENGLISH TESTIMONY.

English and foreign observers who go to Ireland to see things for themselves, and who view things there with unprejudiced minds, confirm the conclusion at which we have arrived. Take, for instance, the letter of a Mr. W. H. Hall, in *The Spectator* of the 4th September, 1886.

Mr. Hall, who is a “Unionist,” says that he attended the Sligo butter market in the course of a recent trip to Ireland, and found the following state of facts :—

“First quality butter fetched 9d. ; second, 8d. ; and third, 6d. per lb. Much seemed to get either first or second mark. Almost all the butter was hand-made, and would, I am confident, have satisfied even Lord Randolph Churchill’s somewhat severe requirements of excellence. The tester informed me that the firkin or one hundred-weight, of first quality butter, worth 84s. yesterday, would have fetched 136s. in 1883, when he was appointed inspector and taster.”

In this sentence, assuredly, the entire case for the reduction of the judicial rents is proved. In '82 the Land Act came into active operation, and in '82, '83, and '84 rents were fixed in the vast majority of cases ; and since then, according to the testimony of this English gentleman, one of the principal articles of Irish agriculture has fallen 40 per cent. in price. But how does the case stand in regard to other articles. Let Mr. Hall speak again :—

“Having visited Ireland myself in 1883, I know that store cattle a year old were worth £7 then, and will hardly fetch £4 now. Hay, too, is unprecedently low—upland being worth 45s. per ton, and inferior, hardly 30s. So that there can be no doubt that the Irish tenant is hit very hard.”

Here, again, we have a fall even greater than that which has taken place in the price of butter; and to the fall of more than 40 per cent. in the price of stock, Mr. Hall testifies of his own personal knowledge. In circumstances such as these, how can the Irish tenants be expected to pay the rents fixed in '82 and '83, even if we allow that, at that time, the rents were fair ?

THE LATEST EVIDENCE.

The latest, and not the least remarkable, evidence on the subject of prices, is that afforded by the transactions at the greatest of Irish fairs—that of Ballinasloe. Let us see to what that evidence amounts.

According to the reports from Ballinasloe, sheep have risen in value from 5s. to 9s. a head, or, on an average, 5s. a head. When this fact was announced, it was made the subject of comment in all the landlord journals, and of course the predictions of “the Parnellites” on the subject of the Irish land crisis were sneered at, ridiculed, and pronounced to have been confuted by the logic of events.

Yet what does the rise in the price of sheep really mean?

The plain fact is, that the rise is one of only 14 per cent., and against this rise we have to set (1) the decrease in 1886, as compared with 1885, in the *number* of sheep in Ireland, which amounts to 3·1 per cent., and (2) the fall in the price of sheep in 1885, as compared with the six previous years, which amounted to no less than 20 per cent.*

In other words, the sheep wealth of the country in the six years previous to 1885, represented by, say, £100, is now, despite the rise referred to, represented by only £88 3s.—that is, it is still 11·7 per cent. under what it was in the six years ending 1884, and should be 11·7 per cent higher than it is, to justify the imposition at the present time of rents based on the average price of sheep in the years between 1878 and 1884.

So much for the rise in the price of sheep of which so much has been made. But what about the price of cattle at Ballinasloe? On this point a silence, a little short of that of the tomb, has

* Mutton in 1885 fell 18·4 per cent. compared with the six previous years, while the wool fell 27 per cent. ; and, as the value of sheep depends on the value of mutton and wool, we may assume that sheep fell 20 per cent. in 1885, as compared with the six previous years.

been preserved by the landlord journals. No wonder, for the facts on this head only too clearly justify the action of the much abused "Parnellites."

In the debate on Mr. Parnell's Land Bill, Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald laid great stress on the fact, that owing to the good turnip crop in England prices for stock were certain to rise. What has happened is that, at the most important fair in Ireland, *cattle have fallen from 15s. to £1 a head.* There is no getting over the fact. In addition, the number of horned stock has fallen in Ireland, in 1886, compared with 1885, to the extent of 44,824 head.

This fall in price, it is said, has not been general at other fairs. But the evidence is that it has been general.

The Irish Farmers' Gazette (not a Nationalist paper) writes in a recent issue :—

"The downward tendency in beef, and in store cattle in particular, still continues, as we learn from the reports of numerous fairs. These remarks may be applied to the following fairs held :—Athy, Belfast, Castleblaney, Clonmel, Kilkee, Rathfriland, Armagh, Dunleer, Belturbet, Fermoy, Killarney, Strabane, and others."

It need not be added, that from the point of view of the general wealth of the country, a fall in the price of cattle is very much more serious than a fall in the price of sheep.

A prominent landlord and landlords' champion, Colonel Raleigh Chichester of Roscommon, has, in a letter to the Dublin daily papers pointed unwittingly a moral in regard to the prices at Ballinasloe, which tells heavily against the landlords' case. "The diminution in the number of our sheep," he says, "represents, I fear, a loss of capital to the extent of £150,000, or 20,000 acres unstocked." The Colonel proceeds to point out, that there has also been a diminution in the number of cattle, which points to an additional unstocking, with no corresponding rise in prices, of, say, 5,601 acres ; and he concludes thus : "Perhaps the most painful element in the general view is the decrease—nearly 49,000—in calves. *This seems to point to loss of purchasing powers*

in the rural labouring class." His general conclusion is that all this is of no consequence ; but most intelligent persons will draw a very different inference.

THE OLD RACK RENTS AND THE JUDICIAL RENTS.

It was absolutely easier for tenants formerly to pay the old rack rents—that is, say, those exacted before the year 1879—than it is for them to pay now the judicial rents fixed before the recent fall in prices.

This fact will be clear from the following figures :—

	Prices for six years ending		Prices for		Fall.	
	1878.		1885.			
	s.	d.	s.	d.		
Wheat per cwt.	10	0	8	6	15 per cent.	
Oats,	8	0	8	0	—	
Barley,	8	2	75	0	9 per cent.	
Flax,	67	0	55	0	18 „	
Butter,	122	4	75	6	39 „	
Beef,	77	1	56	6	27 „	
Mutton,	83	2	65	5	23 „	
Pork,	55	3	43	6	20 „	
Wool per lb.	1	5	0	8	52 „	

In other words, there was an average fall of 22·5 per cent. in the prices of those nine articles of produce in 1885, compared with the prices of the same articles in the six years ending 1878, while the judicial rents fixed up to August, 1885, are only 19·4 lower than the old rack rents.

To put the case otherwise. It is notorious that the competition for land in Ireland was so great, that persons were found willing in the past to consent to pay rents which could not possibly leave them a fair proportion of the profits. As a necessary consequence of this land hunger, the general standard of rent throughout the country became unfairly high. The evil at last became so great, that Parliament passed the Act of 1870 to mitigate it, and when that measure failed, Parliament made a further effort in the same direction by passing the Act of 1881.

Under that act rents have been reduced on an average 19·4 per cent. up to 21st August, 1884 ; but prices have fallen 22·5 per cent. So that the evil complained of has actually been aggravated, while judicial rents have a sort of parliamentary sanction, which the old rack rents never had. But even if the reduction in rents had kept pace with the fall in prices, the rents would still be unfair. To secure fair rents, the rent reductions must be greater than the fall in prices.

Rent is only the landlord's share of the gross produce of the land. The produce is divided into three portions, not equal, however: First, Cost of production ; Second, Tenant's share ; and Third, Landlord's share. Now, the cost of production varies comparatively little, or, rather, it is very difficult to reduce it ; therefore, when a fall in price comes only a very small portion of it can be borne by the share of the gross produce which is devoted to paying this cost. It is, as a rule, far the largest of the three portions.

Again, in Ireland the standard of living amongst the rural population has been extremely low—a circumstance due chiefly to the fact that they have not, owing to the competition for land, received a fair share of the gross produce. The standard of living being low, cannot bear a further reduction, and therefore the second portion also, or tenant's share, can bear but little of the fall in the price of produce.

It is clear, then, that the fall must be mainly borne by the third, or landlord's share ; and therefore a fall of 22·5 per cent. in the price of produce, will in many cases necessitate, in justice, a reduction, not of 22 per cent. or 19 per cent., but of 50 or 60 per cent. in the rent.

1886 WORSE THAN 1880.

The crisis is greater now than when the Compensation for Disturbance Bill passed the House of Commons in 1880, for, as the following tables show, the fall of prices then was less than it is now :—

	Prices for six years previous to 1879.			Prices for years 1879-1880.			Per centage fall or rise.
		s.	d.		s.	d.	
Wheat per cwt.	...	10	0	...	10	2	1·6 per cent. rise.
Oats,	...	8	0	...	8	0	No change.
Barley,	...	8	2	...	8	0	2 per cent. fall.
Flax,	...	67	7	...	66	6	1·6 „ „
Butter,	...	122	4	...	103	0	15·8 „ „
Beef,	...	77	1	...	65	0	16·7 „ „
Mutton,	...	83	2	...	74	8	10·22 „ „
Pork,	...	55	3	...	59	3	6·8 „ rise.
Wool per lb.	...	1	5	...	1	1	23 „ fall.

	Prices for six years ending 1884.			Prices in 1885.			Per centage fall or rise.
		s.	d.		s.	d.	
Wheat per cwt.	...	9	5	...	8	6	9·7 per cent. fall
Oats,	...	7	7	...	8	0	5·2 „ rise.
Barley,	...	7	9	...	7	5	4·3 „ fall
Flax,	...	59	10	...	55	0	8·0 „ „
Butter,	...	103	6	...	75	6	27·0 „ „
Beef,	...	67	0	...	56	6	15·6 „ „
Mutton,	...	79	0	...	65	5	18·4 „ „
Pork,	...	54	7	...	43	6	20·3 „ „
Wool per lb.	...	0	11	...	0	8	27·0 „ „

Yet the smaller fall—that in 1879 and 1880—was one of the potent causes of the introduction into and passage through the House of Commons of a Compensation for Disturbance Bill, and the results that followed from its rejection by the House of Lords are only too well known.

EVIDENCE OF THE LAND COMMISSIONERS.

The Land Commissioners themselves practically admit that the rents fixed by them before the recent great fall in prices are now too high. This admission will be plain to anyone who will observe the difference in the judicial rents fixed up to August, 1885, and those fixed in the months of January, February, March, and April, 1886—that is, after the fall in prices which took place in 1885. Here are the figures :—

Judicial rents fixed up to August, 1885, are :—

In Ulster,	4·2 per cent. below the valuation.
„ Leinster,	15·3 „ above „
„ Connaught,	13·2 „ „ „
„ Munster,	25·8 „ „ „

Judicial rents fixed in January, February, March, and April, 1886, are :—

In Ulster,	9·7 per cent. below the valuation.
„ Leinster,	16·0 „ „ „
„ Connaught,	18·0 „ „ „
„ Munster,	1·14 „ above „

No one can fail to see the striking contrast between the earlier reductions and the later ones—these later being evidently brought about by the fall in prices since 1884.

In addition, the Commissioners are giving larger reductions off the old rents.

Up to 21st August, 1885, the reductions averaged 19·4 per cent.

In January, February, March, and April, 1886, they averaged 28 per cent.

These two facts show clearly that the judicial rents fixed in 1886 are considerably lower than those previously fixed, and prove absolutely that the great bulk of the tenants holding under judicial rents are rented according to an unfairly high standard.

LANDLORD ADMISSIONS.

Some of the landlords themselves have indirectly, but in the most practical manner, admitted that the judicial rents are rack rents ; for the landlords in question have actually granted more or less considerable abatements in or reductions of the judicial rents, which the present Tory Government and the majority of the present House of Commons have virtually pronounced to be too sacred to be altered. The following reductions on judicial rents have been granted within the last few weeks :—

Judge Flanagan (late of the Landed Estates Court) on Clare property,	20 per cent.
Captain O'Callaghan (same county),	...	20	„
T. MacMahon (same county),	...	20	„
Earl of Shannon (Co. Cork),	..	15	„
Lord Inchiquin (Co. Clare),	...	20	„
Rev. J. Blennerhassett (Co. Cork),	...	20	„
Captain Woodley (same county),	...	20	„
Earl of Bantry (same county),	...	10	„
A. H. Smith Barry, M.P. (same county),	...	20	„
Earl of Listowel (Co. Kerry),	...	25	„
Countess of Morley (Co. Cavan),	...	30	„
Colonel Stevenson (same county),	...	30	„
Lord Lismore (Co. Limerick),	...	25	„
Earl of Donoughmore (Co. Waterford),	...	20	„
Frederick J. Graham (Co. Galway),	...	25	„
The Marquis of Lansdowne (Co. Kerry),	...	20	„

This list might be considerably extended, and it demonstrates beyond all doubt the unfairness of the judicial rents fixed before the recent great fall in prices, and consequently shows the justice of Mr. Parnell's Land Bill, which would merely have rendered compulsory on all Irish landlords what some like those mentioned in the foregoing list have done of their own accord.

EXPRESS ADMISSIONS.

But this is not all. Some of the best known landlords in Ireland have expressly admitted the justice of Mr. Parnell's proposals. Take the following resolution passed on the 8th September by the Naas Board of Guardians, and approved of, amongst others, by Baron de Robeck, J.P. D.L., the ("Loyalist" and Tory Candidate for North Kildare at the election in November, 1885), by Mr. G. P. L. Mansfield, J.P. D.L., and Major Borrowes, J.P. D.L., all extensive landlords:—

"This Board is of opinion, that unless the Government take immediate steps to put a stay on capricious eviction, pending legislation on the Land Question, the country will be plunged into a state of misery, and ruin, and starvation, from which it will take the exertions of a generation

to recover ; and we call the particular attention of the landlords to this important fact—believing that their interests, as well as those of the tenants, and of the country in general, will be judiciously served and promoted by their making substantial abatements in rents at this alarming juncture.”

The resolution as it originally stood expressed a belief, “that 50 per cent. under the Government valuation would be the very least reduction commensurate with this unprecedented and unforeseen depression,” and this gave rise to the following observations :—

“BARON DE ROBECK.—I would not agree to a hard and fast line of 50 per cent. reduction on the valuation. Where one man might want that, another would not. It may be necessary in some cases, but not in all. I would agree to everything but the fixing of a hard and fast line at 50 per cent. below the valuation.”

“Mr. MANSFIELD.—I take precisely the same view of it as the Baron.”

“BARON DE ROBECK.—I quite agree with Mr. Fenelon *in everything* barring the per-cent-age in the resolution. I think the common sense policy of the landlords would be to meet their tenants in a fair and straightforward manner.”

Among the statements of Mr. Fenelon, adopted by Baron de Robeck and Mr. Mansfield, we find the following :—

“With bad prices and a bad crop, the question arises—where are the rents to come from? *Unless extraordinary concessions are made by the landlords, the great majority of the tenants will be able to pay no rents at all.*”

And in face of all this, Mr. Parnell and the Irish Parliamentary Party, because of their recent action on the land question, have been accused of “manufacturing a crisis” for “base personal ends,” and of desiring without any cause to create and foster a “no rent” movement, in order to throw the country into turmoil and disorder !

RENT REDUCTIONS IN ENGLAND.

The justice of the claim for a reduction of rents in accordance with the fall in prices has been indirectly admitted by many Englishmen opposed to the Irish demands. One testimony, out

of many that might be given to the same effect, may be here quoted.

Mr. Beadel, M.P. for Mid-Essex—a member of the Tory party, and an estate agent and land surveyor by profession—replying, in the House of Commons on the 13th September, 1886, to some criticisms of Mr. Clancy, M.P., on the action of the Receiver of Crown Rents, said :—

“ If the hon. member (Mr. Clancy) had the experience of Mr. Clutton or himself, he would know that *it was impossible to let some farms, even if no rent were to be paid at all.*”

Mr. Beadel, of course, was referring to England ; and, if what he said be true of that country, in which farmers have by means of large capital, agricultural appliances of the best sort, and scientific methods of cultivation, a very much better chance of making money by farming, how much more true must it be of Ireland, where those advantages exist in a very diminished degree?

The Irish case, again, is indirectly proved by the action of the English landlords, in *voluntarily reducing* the rents of their own tenants to an extent, generally speaking, undreamt of in Ireland. It is notorious that many farms in various parts of England are at present let to tenants, on condition merely that they pay the rates and taxes, and keep the fences and drains in order.

Here are some recent rent reductions in England and Scotland taken from the *Land Agents' Record* :—

Lord Lonsdale, estates in Westmorland and Cumberland,	20	per cent.
Lord Zetland, a return on 20 per cent. on <i>half</i> year,		
Luftus in Cumberland, ...	20	“
Duke of Sutherland (Scotland) to sheep farmers, ...	40	“
Lord Fitzhardinge, Gloucestershire, <i>permanent</i> reduction,	20	“
Mr. Wise, Leamington, ...	25	“
Walter Morrison, Malham Farm, Yorkshire, reduces rents based on current rates of 1884, ...	50	“
Duke of Wellington, Strathfieldsaye, on Michaelmas rents,	50	“
Mr. Richard Benyon, near Reading, Berks, and Hants estates, on year's rents, ...	50	“
Mr. Lewis Pugh, ex-M.P., on estate in Cardiganshire, ...	50	“

In considering rent reductions in England, moreover, it must be borne in mind that English landlords let their farms with all buildings, fences, etc., in good order, whereas in Ireland these necessary adjuncts to the farm are not only kept in repair, but are, as a rule, made entirely by the tenants. English landlords have, therefore, a larger property in their farms, and have a right to receive a larger proportion of the gross produce as rent. It follows from this that a reduction given of the rent in England represents a greater concession to the tenant than a similar reduction in Ireland.

THE "INCREASED YIELD" ARGUMENT.

But it is said that, if prices have fallen, the increased yield of the crops makes up, and more than makes up, for the loss. *The Economist*, in an article which appeared on 18th September, made itself responsible for this dishonest argument.

The Economist, in order to prove its thesis, compares the year 1882 with the year 1885.

In the first place, returns regarding the yield of crops are collected by the Constabulary, and must necessarily be of a very uncertain and unsatisfactory character, as at best they can be based only on conjecture. If we take them, however, as approximately correct, it is manifestly unfair to select the *worst* year as regards produce out of the past six years, and compare it with an average year like 1885; yet this is exactly what *The Economist* has done!

Instead of taking a year of exceptionally low produce, let us take two average years like 1880 and 1881—years, the state of things in which certainly had as much influence on the fixing of the judicial rents, as that in any other year or years—and compare them with 1885.

In 1885, out of the total extent of land under crops, the greater part by far was under oats, potatoes, and meadow. In considering this matter of crops, therefore, for all practical purposes it will be sufficient only to consider those three crops.

The average yield of oats in 1880 and 1881 was 14·1 cwt. per

acre ; in 1885 it was 13·6, or less by 5 cwt. per acre, or 3·5 per cent.—a fall that more than counterbalanced the rise of 3·2 in price in 1885, compared with 1880 and 1881.

The average yield of potatoes in 1880 and 1881 was 3·8 tons per acre ; in 1885 it was 4 tons. Here we have an increase in 1885 of 2 tons per acre, or 5·2 per cent. ; but this increase sinks into insignificance in comparison with the fall in price in 1885, compared with 1880 and 1881, of 26 per cent.

The average yield of hay remained the same in the two periods ; but according to the returns in *The Irish Farmers' Gazette*, they fell 10·4 per cent. in price in 1885, compared with 1880 and 1881.

The fall in some parts of the country, indeed, was far greater. Good hay could be bought in North Kerry last winter for £7 a ton, and, at times, for fifteen shillings a ton.

What, then, becomes of the great discovery of *The Economist* ?

THE GOVERNMENT VALUATION AND RENTS.

It has been alleged that judicial rents are fair, because they are not much in excess of the Government (Griffith's) valuation, which, it is further alleged, was made on a basis of very low prices laid down in the act. The first answer is that, though a low scale of prices *was* laid down in the act, that scale was not adhered to by the valuers, who were, on the contrary, guided by the high prices which existed during the period of their operations—from 1853 to 1865.

This is clear from the evidence given before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1869—a period when prices were very high and had been for many years.

		Price laid down in Valuation Act.		Prices for five years ending 1869.	
		s.	d.	s.	d.
Wheat, per cwt.,		...	7 6	...	13 5
Oats, „		...	4 10	...	8 11
Barley, „		...	5 6	...	9 11
Flax, „		...	49 0	...	89 0
Butter, „		...	65 4	...	112 0
Beef, „		...	35 6	..	68 7
Mutton, „		...	41 0	...	67 10

We quote from the examination of Sir John Ball Greene, then Assistant Commissioner, now Commissioner of Valuation in Ireland :—

“1053. Do you consider the valuation of Ulster low?—No.”

“1054. Do you consider it up to the full present value of the land? Not quite.—I do not consider it up to the full letting value.”

“412. In Ulster what amount below the letting value is the Government valuation?—I think if you added 2s. in the pound you would have a fair letting value.”

“415. You say there is a difference between the North and South of 15 per cent.—I am sure there is.”

“416. Is not the difference still larger?—In some cases it may be as high as 20 per cent.”

Sir Richard Griffith, Chief Commissioner of Valuation, said in answer to questions :—

“1716. Our opinion, as I said before, is that it [Ulster] was valued very high, and that it does not require a re-valuation.”

“5263. You say the valuation in the South ought to be raised 5s. in the pound?—I think it ought.”

“5264. And in the North?—Nothing from what it is now.”

In other words, although prices had risen enormously, Sir Richard Griffith, speaking in '69, stated that the valuation in Ulster would bear no increase whatever, and that of the South only 5s. in the pound. It may be added, that in a carefully prepared return, handed in by him, the proposed addition in the South only averaged 4s. in the pound. Is it not clear, therefore, that Ulster was valued on existing prices, and not on the scale laid down in the Act? Because if the valuation were equal to a fair letting value in '69, or within 10 per cent. of the full letting value, it cannot have been made on a scale of prices which was some 50 per cent. lower than those then existing.

But more: the actual rents paid affected the valuation. Sir John Ball Greene distinctly states that the rent paid was an element for the valuers to consider, while the valuers themselves were men accustomed to value for the purpose of fixing and—it might almost be said—of raising rents.*

* See the evidence of Sir Richard Griffith, question 1335.

Amounts of rents were actually ascertained by surveyors, who preceded the valuers, and were stated in the books, handed to the valuers,* and the valuations made by the valuers in the field were afterwards altered to agree more closely with the rents paid.†

Secondly, the Government valuation, compared with the judicial rents, shows the judicial rents to have been fixed too high. As we have just seen, Sir Richard Griffith and Sir John Ball Greene, according to a carefully prepared return (given on page 228, Evidence before Select Committee, 1869), propose to add on the average 4s. in the pound to the valuation of the three Southern Provinces, in order to bring it up to a level with the fair letting value of the lands as they were in 1869—making no reduction whatever for tenants' improvements. But the judicial rents fixed up to 21st August, 1885, and professing at least not to include the tenants' improvements, instead of being on a level with or lower than the valuation—as would seem proper from the fact that the valuation represented nearly the fair letting value in 1869, and that prices were lower for the six years ending 1884, than for the six years ending 1869—were actually 19 per cent. above the valuation in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught.

The following are the figures for the four provinces and for the County of Kerry :—

In Ulster the judicial rents are 4.2 per cent. below the valuation.

In Leinster	„	„	15.3	„	above	„
In Connaught	„	„	13.2	„	„	„
In Munster	„	„	25.8	„	„	„
In Kerry	„	„	45.0	„	„	„

SALES OF TENANTS' INTERESTS.

One of the arguments most frequently urged in the defence of the existing rack rents is, that, although the rents of holdings in Ireland are alleged to be unfair, persons are found to give large

* See evidence of Duffy, question 2012, and of Hitchcock, 3804.

† See evidence of Lynam, question 2272, and of Hitchcock, 3788.

prices for the tenants' interests ; and occasionally tables are given showing that those prices vary from 10 to as many as 50 years' purchase of the annual rent. The argument is a plausible one, but utterly delusive.

1. Generally speaking—and especially in the case of the most recently published tables of the kind referred to—no particulars, such as names of places or persons, are ever given, and thus it is impossible to investigate the truth or accuracy of the figures. This fact of itself throws great doubt—to say the least, on the genuineness of the tables. They may be absolute inventions, so far as anyone outside the persons who publish them can tell. Even if we admit them to be genuine, it is still all-important to be able to investigate the circumstances of each particular case of sale for it makes a very great difference whether the sale is merely that of the goodwill of an average farm, or that of one which is very highly cultivated, on which the tenant has made exceptional improvements, and in which he has a large legal estate. A high price paid for a holding of the latter sort would be in no way remarkable, and would be no test whatever of the real value of the tenant's interest in an average holding. The probability is, that it is solely or chiefly holdings of the exceptionally valuable class that *now* fetch high prices.

2. The fact—if it be a fact—that the interest of a tenant in a holding brings a high price, is not at all, by necessity, a proof of the conclusion drawn by the landlords and their champions. On the contrary, the fact that the holding is sold at all is, in nine cases out of ten, proof that it is unprofitable at the existing rent, for, in nine cases out of ten, no tenant disposes of his holding until he is a penniless and ruined man. The real explanation of many, if not of most sales, is that the incoming tenant, despite the failure of his predecessor, hopes that by the application of capital he may succeed where the other failed.

3. The question is, does the incoming tenant, as a rule, succeed where his predecessor failed ? Is anyone able to produce instances of such success ? The most notorious fact is, that amongst those

who are crying out most loudly against the judicial rents, are the few tenants who have bought at high prices the interests of their predecessors in title.

4. But, even if we suppose for a moment that the tenant's interest is worth at the time of sale what it is said to fetch, that fact will not prevent that interest from being destroyed or ceasing to exist under the present system of fixing rents; for if it is clear that if prices fall, as they have fallen since 1884, and if the rent remains unchanged, the value of the holding to the tenant, which might be represented by, say, £100 at the time of purchase, may dwindle to nothing at all in the course of a year or two, and that the sum the tenant may then receive from a more hopeful but a less experienced speculator may actually represent only the amount of money he has lost in the interval.

5. It is a matter of notorious fact that the persons who give high or any prices 'for tenants' interests are scarcely ever agriculturists of the ordinary or average type, but little capitalists who have made money at some other business abroad or at home, and want land for other purposes than those aimed at by the ordinary farmer. They are shopkeepers who want land to aid them in their proper business of shopkeeping, or returned emigrants who desire a spot on "the old sod" on which to settle down in the evening of their days, or speculators, who know not what they are about, and only discover their mistake when they are ruined in their turn; or police pensioners who want a home, and whose pensions save them from the necessity of living by agriculture; or tenants who desire additions to their farms, in the vain expectation that the additional lands will afford them larger means of living.

6. The following extract from a speech by Mr. Chaplin, M.P., in the House of Commons, on the 24th August of the present year, supplies in large part the explanation of cases in which sales of tenants' interests have been made to ordinary agriculturists:—"Over a large part of the country," says Mr. Chaplin, "there was scarcely any means of subsistence for the population apart

from the land, and in consequence there had always been an excessive and unnatural demand for its possession." This is perfectly true. There being no other industry in Ireland but agriculture, the people naturally looked to the land, and strove to get hold of it at almost any price, and the landlords' interests, being then impossible of attainment, it only remained for them to purchase the interests of the occupiers which thus required a fictitious value.

7. Lastly, the cases of tenant right sale, which are not covered by the undue competition referred to, are accounted for by the natural passion for a piece of land, for which the Irish tenantry have ever been remarkable, and which has led them to pay fancy prices for the coveted prize—eventually to their bitter cost.*

When all this is taken into account, the high prices alleged to be paid for the interests of the tenants, will be seen to furnish no argument whatever in favour of the fairness of the existing rents.

THE "SAVINGS BANK" ARGUMENT.

It is said that, though the Irish tenants are alleged to be impoverished, they must have large reserves of money laid by,

* A striking proof of this assertion is afforded by the following telegram from Limerick in the London *Standard* of 25th October, 1886 :—
"At the sitting of the Land Sub-Commissioners, at Six-mile-bridge, during the past week, rent reductions, ranging from 10 to 33 per cent., were made. In one case, where the tenant's rent was reduced from £16 odd to ten guineas, the chairman, Mr. Crean, said he was personally opposed to the reduction, as the tenant in 1883 had paid £270 for the interest, or twenty-six years' purchase of the judicial rent. Mr. O'Shaughnessy said it was the value of the land the Sub-Commissioners had to decide, and not what was paid for the interest. The land was excessively bad, and if the tenant was the fool to give so large an amount for the interest, he knew he had this Land Court to go into for a reduction. The Sub-Commissioners had met many farmers who would grab the land and would pay anything for it. Mr. Crean said Mr. O'Shaughnessy's observations were true; but the case illustrated the individual folly of the tenant in paying so large a sum for his tenant-right."

seeing that there are over four millions of money on deposit in the Savings' Banks. This threadbare argument has been again and again refuted, and cannot stand a moment's examination.

It is notorious that, except in rare cases, the depositors in those "popular" banks are not farmers at all, but artizans in towns, and persons having fixed wages—such as servants, policemen, and other public employes. This fact is clearly indicated by an analysis of the localities in which the money in the Post Office Savings' Banks is deposited. By far the greater part of it is placed to credit in the large towns, and only a very small proportion in the rural districts. Thus, from the latest return* of the deposits in the Post Office Savings' Banks in Ireland, we extract the following facts :—

Of the entire amount credited to Dublin County—namely, £464,896—as much as £436,731 has been deposited in the city and suburbs where the depositors are well known *not* to be farmers. Of the entire amount—£291,056—credited to the County of Antrim, the large town of Belfast contributes £178,106. Of the entire amount credited to Cork County—£185,924—the City of Cork gives £82,503. Of the entire amount credited to Limerick—£55,640—the City of Limerick yields £38,744. Of the entire amount credited to Waterford County—£33,648—the City of Waterford gives £20,977. And of the gross amount deposited in the Post Office Savings' Banks throughout Ireland—namely, £2,224,346—no less than £757,061, or 34 per cent., is actually contributed by the five principal cities in Ireland. The same is true of the deposits in the Trustee Savings' Banks. But even if we admit, for argument sake, that the deposits in the Savings' Banks and in similar institutions, are those of agricultural tenants in Ireland, then the argument proves too much for the landlords and their advocates ; for the

* Since this tract was written, a later return of deposits in the Post Office Savings Banks has been issued ; but the main facts remain the same.

interest allowed on them is only 6d. in the pound, or $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and consequently, if farmers consider them better investments than their farms, farming must be a most unprofitable speculation.

Englishmen will understand the absurdity of “the Savings’ Bank argument,” if they reflect that the deposits in their Savings’ Banks have also increased steadily in amount, year by year, since the institution of those establishments, although in the interval there have been severe periods of agricultural and commercial depression. Thus, deposits in the English Post Office Savings’, which in 1871 amounted to £15,939,008, reached in 1885 the total of £44,289,875 ; and every year between 1871 and 1885 witnessed an increase in those deposits. Yet, as the world knows, very many of the fourteen years between those two dates have been years of severe strain in English agricultural and commercial circles. The truth as regards England, no less than as regards Ireland, is that the Post Office Savings’ Banks, having afforded a new form of investment, have attracted to themselves year by year a greater portion of the savings of the community that had either not been deposited anywhere before, or had been deposited at greater risk in other places, and that the depositors are chiefly those who, like servants, have fixed wages, and not those who, like agriculturists, earn fluctuating incomes.

THE ARGUMENT FROM “DRINK.”

It is pointed out again that, although the Irish tenantry are said to be getting poorer, they are spending more money on drink year by year, and hence it is inferred that they are not so poor as they are represented.

This is another specious argument ; but utterly untenable.

In calculating the amount of money spent on drink, no distinction is taken between the amount spent by the inhabitants of the cities, and that spent by the residents in the rural districts or between the amount spent by the richer classes and that spent by

the working population of artizans, farmers, and labourers. Yet it is clear that, of the amount spent by the working population, by far the greater part must be expended by the dwellers in the towns, for the inhabitants of the rural localities mostly go into the towns (where nearly all the drink is sold) only once a week—on market days—or not so often ; and it is also clear enough that, of the entire amount of money spent on drink, the greater part must be expended by the richer classes, including the landlords, whose drink is very much more costly. A bottle of champagne, for example, would cost as much as thirty bottles of porter.

The statistics of arrests for drunkenness and the working of the Sunday Closing Act strongly suggest—or rather prove—that if the drink bill has gone up, the fact is due to increased expenditure, not on the part of the poorer classes, but on the part of the richer. The cases of week-day arrests for drunkenness numbered 108,000 in 1877, and only 90,000 in 1885 ; in cases of Sunday arrests for drunkenness, there is a reduction of 60 or 70 per cent. It is well-known, and it will not be denied, that the persons arrested for drunkenness everywhere chiefly belong to the humbler classes. A reduction, therefore, in the number of arrests for drunkenness, presumes less drinking on the part of the humbler classes.

But, finally, it appears that the drink bill has not gone up at all ! Sir William Harcourt, in the debate in the House of Commons on Mr. Parnell's Bill, on 21st September, disposed as follows of the falsehood that it had increased :—

“The nature of it [the drink argument] is that the Irish people must be more prosperous because they drink more than they used to do. But is it true that they are drinking more ? I took up yesterday the latest returns of the Board of Trade—the return for August. Taking out the quantity of spirits kept for consumption in Ireland, it appears that in the first six months of 1884 the consumption was 2,423,000 gallons ; in 1885 it was 2,343,000 gallons ; and in 1886 it was 2,209,000 gallons—a regular but most rapid decrease in the first six months of 1886. Well, the drink argument is a very silly argument at the best ; but when you are using silly arguments you might as well have your facts correct.”

MR. PARRELL'S BILL AND THE "LOYALIST" FARMERS.

The pretence that the present movement for a reduction of the judicial rents is but "the latest dodge" of the Irish National League for keeping the country in hot water, receives its *coup de grace* when it is mentioned that the "loyalist" farmers of Ulster are in thorough sympathy with it. We append one or two striking proofs of this fact.

The Belfast *Morning News* of the 7th October, gives a report of "a meeting of representatives from several polling districts in North Antrim," on the Wednesday previous, in the Town Hall, Ballymoney. The meeting in question was presided over by Mr. William Stewart, J.P.; it was chiefly composed of men who have hitherto been followers of Lord Hartington and the English Whig party, and its object was declared to be to establish an association on "broad liberal principles." The result was the establishment of the "Route Reform Club," and the unanimous adoption of the following resolution :—

"That the Tenants' Relief Bill, being founded upon urgent necessities, we thank Mr. Parnell for its introduction, and acknowledge with pleasure the practical and creditable manner in which Mr. John Pinkerton, M.P., vindicated the claims of the farmers to relief from rents which natural and other causes rendered impossible; and we hereby respectfully urge the landlords to take into favourable consideration the present deplorable condition of their tenantry, and make substantial and adequate reductions in rent."

Mr. John Pinkerton is of course the Presbyterian Nationalist Member for Galway, the reference to him in the resolution of the Route Club being evidently caused by his being an Antrim man.

Again, in the Belfast *Northern Whig*, of 15th September we find a report of a meeting of another body, the members of which would all doubtless energetically repudiate the notion that they were Parnellites or National Leaguers—the Lisburn Tenant Right Association; but which, nevertheless, adopted unanimously the following resolutions :—

"Considering the present deplorable agricultural crisis, caused by the

ruinous fall in the prices of grain, potatoes, cattle, and butter—a fall which could not possibly have been foreseen in fixing judicial and other rents—we declare our conviction that widespread ruin will fall on the agricultural community if the present rents are exacted this year; and that the inability of farmers to meet their present engagements is so real and severe, that the state of the country calls for the immediate attention of the Government.

“We believe that the justice of the farmers’ case demands that rents should be at once adjusted to a sliding scale, taking into account the fall of prices since they were originally fixed, and that such an immediate reduction should be effected through the agency of the Land Courts, as would prevent the almost universal insolvency with which farmers are at present threatened.

“We urge on the Government the necessity of taking steps to stay evictions, mainly caused by the imposition of rents fixed in better times, and not reduced in proportion to the fall in the markets. Measures should also be taken to enable tenants holding leases to enter the Land Courts, in order to have equitable rents fixed. As the agricultural crisis is more severe than is generally acknowledged, we trust no delay will be permitted to deprive agriculturists of immediate relief.”

More important even than the foregoing resolutions was the speech of the chairman of the meeting—Mr. William Gray—which is reported as follows by *The Northern Whig*:—

“The chairman said that meeting was composed, not of revolutionists, nor of alarmists, nor of senseless agitators, but of men whose aim and object was and is to deal fairly by all classes of the community—(hear, hear)—men who did not give utterance to their grievances without good cause (hear, hear). The acute crisis in agriculture, which has been increasing in volume and intensity since 1879, has now assumed a stage that *no one anticipated a few years ago*. The depressed state of farming not only in Ireland, but all over Great Britain, it was hoped and believed a few years ago, would shortly pass away. Instead of passing away, it has become more intense from year to year.”

The significance of those remarks, lies in the fact that *Mr. Gray, like Mr. Mahony, M.P., was a Land Commissioner*. Thus, the Member for Meath, in stating in the House of Commons, said that the Land Courts, in fixing rents before 1885, did not contemplate the possibility of such a fall in prices as has since occurred, is directly corroborated by one to whom even the suspicion of Nationalism does not attach.

SUNDRY LANDLORD ARGUMENTS.

In the course of the debate on Mr. Parnell's Bill in the House of Commons, an attempt was made to rebut the case put forward by the Irish leader and the Irish party. The strength of the counter-case may be judged from the more important of the statements with which it was sought to bolster it up.

(1) It was stated that 100,000 judicial rents had been fixed up to 31st December, 1884, and 70,000 subsequently ; and that consequently out of 170,000 persons holding under judicial rents, Mr. Parnell's Bill, which would not have affected those settled after 1884, would only give relief to 100,000.

Such are the figures with which a member of the Irish Government attempted to mislead the English public ! As a matter of fact, 153,465 judicial rents had been fixed up to 31st December, 1884, and only 21,902 have been fixed since that date !

(2) It was stated that the price of stock in no way affected the owners of the small holdings in Ireland, such as exist along the coasts of Donegal, Sligo, Mayo, and Galway.

To any one who really knows that part of the country, such a statement is seen at once to be absurd, because in all these districts there are large tracts of mountain grazing, on which cattle can run during the summer ; and the small tenants there, almost without exception, possess a few head of cattle, which they bring into their own wretched homes during the winter. So far from the price of stock not affecting these small tenants, it has hit them with particular severity, because mountain stock has fallen far more in value than any other class of stock—in fact it has become in many places quite unsaleable.

(3) It was stated by the Solicitor-General for Ireland that wool had risen 60 per cent. in value.

In the first place, this was a very serious misstatement. The average price of wool for the year 1885 was 8d. per lb. ; for the two first weeks of October, 1885, it averaged 8½d. per lb. ; and for the two first weeks of October, 1886, it averaged 9¾d. per lb. ; the increase was thus only 16 per cent.

But, secondly, the price of wool is so very unimportant a factor in Irish farming, that it is almost ridiculous to refer to it at all as an element that ought to regulate rents.

A Return for 1885, carefully prepared for the Government, shows the following values for that year :—

Crops,	£29,873,000
Milk, and its products,	14,000,000
Live Stock,	16,800,000
Wool,	320,000

(4) It has been stated that butter has lately risen greatly in price.

Butter always rises in price during the autumn, because the supply becomes limited. Taking, however, the average price of butter for the first nine months of 1885, and comparing it with the first nine months of 1886, it will be found that there has been a fall of 4s. 3d. per cwt.—the price for nine months of 1885 being 76s. 5d., and for a similar period of 1886, 72s. 2d. It is true that butter is slightly higher at present than at the same period last year; but during the months of May, June, July, and August, when the bulk of the butter is made, it averaged 68s. 10d. per cwt. in 1885, and only 64s. 2d. per cwt. in 1886.

OTHER LANDLORD PLEAS.

It may be well to notice, in conclusion, some other landlord pleas against a further measure of protection for the Irish tenantry, pending a final settlement of the Land Question.

“THE TENANT CAN GO.”

(1) *The Times*, in its issue of the 16th October, says :—

“If we look into the matter, we see that the Irish tenant has exactly the same legitimate means of compelling the landlord to reduce the rent if owing to bad seasons or low prices it is too high, that the English or Scotch tenant possesses and uses. If the latter finds the rent too high, he tells the landlord he will give up the farm unless it is reduced, and, as the landlord has no desire in these times to have farms thrown on his hand, he is generally willing to come to terms. In Ireland the tenant, whether he has had his rent judicially fixed or not, can resort to the same remedy.”

This is a statement which must be met with a flat denial. One can only wonder at the audacity it discloses. If anything at all be certain, it is that the position of an average tenant-farmer in England is totally different from that of a tenant-farmer in Ireland. The tenant in England, if he gives up his farm, can easily acquire another ; the tenant in Ireland, if he gives up his farm, or is evicted from it, cannot, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, get another, and his only alternative is to emigrate, or become a labourer in the nearest town—the poverty and misery in which he thus increases, or to go with his entire family to the workhouse, and thus add to the rates. Again : in England the tenant very often has no great interest in his holding, for the improvements have been made or allowed for by the landlord, and it thus costs him no great pang to move from one place to another ; in Ireland, on the other hand, the tenant is tied to his holding, wretched and unprofitable though it be, not only by the fact that he has no other means of livelihood, but also by the fact that all the improvements have been the work of himself or his ancestors ; that the labour of his life and of theirs is sunk in it, and can never be properly estimated or paid for ; that it is the home of his childhood ; and that it is wound up in his mind with all else that he holds dear in life. In short, only the most perverse, or the most ignorant, can fail to see the almost immeasurable difference between the position of the farmer in Ireland and the farmer in England.

RENT-RAISING IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

(2) "Moreover," says *The Times*, in the same issue, "it must be remembered that, whereas the rental of England, and still more of Scotland, showed an enormous increase in the quarter of a century preceding 1880, the rental of Ireland during the same period—that is, before the reductions consequent on the Land Act, the bad seasons, and the fall of prices—showed an actual diminution."

The inference, of course, is that Irish landlords ought not to be asked to make as large abatements now as English landlords.

This is simply another falsehood, so far as the statement applies to Ireland. *The Times*, we may observe, has borrowed it from a publication issued by a landlord organization, which itself had to go so far afield for this bogus "fact" as the *British Agricultural Gazette*.

Rent-raising was a common practice in Ireland after 1850. It was carried on by various devices. There was, for instance, the silent system, according to which, on every change of tenancy—whether by assignment, by succession, or on marriage—the screw, as it used to be popularly said, was put on, and the rent raised. There was, again, the periodical system, claimed as an incident of the Ulster custom, of raising the rental all round at stated periods. There was, again, the felonious system, to borrow a phrase of the late Lord Clarendon, of raising rents without any such excuses, the moment the tenants had improved their holdings, and of thus confiscating at a blow what it had taken years of unremitting toil to create.

Both the Devon Commission and the Bessborough Commission, we may add here, officially reported, in corroboration of a great mass of testimony to the same effect, that the Irish landlords, as a rule, neither improved nor repaired—the fact that English landlords had done both being the justification for increasing rents in England.

The chief field for rent raising was the region of barren, unprofitable land which had been, often at incredibly great expense, reclaimed and brought under cultivation. Such was until recently the condition of mind of the Irish tenant that he scarcely resented an increase of rent being levied on him on account of reclamation effected without any aid whatever from his landlord. It was only when the whole value was taken away by a rise of rent—when the screw was turned unbearably tight—that he rebelled. And for teaching him to rise against such infamous exactions, the Land League and the National League have been denounced as preachers of immoral doctrine!

As to the period before 1850, rents were so high in some places

that there was no possibility of raising them. The reason is plain. The period of the Napoleonic wars was a veritable golden age for landowners. Prices of farm produce rose immensely, and up in proportion went the rents. After the close of the Napoleonic era, and the resumption of cash payments, of course the enormous rents could not only not be increased, but necessarily fell with the disappearance of the inflated prices. But they were lowered as little as possible; and now, because they were lowered at all the landlords actually boast of their justice and moderation. Some kept on exacting the Napoleonic rents; and their successors of the present day are often found attempting to prove how just they have been in their dealings with their tenantry, by proudly pointing to the fact that their rents have not been changed for seventy years or more; oblivious or ignorant of the fact, that thereby they are affording the best possible evidence that they are now exacting monstrous rack-rents.

THE POWERS OF THE COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

(3) It has been said that the County Court Judges in Ireland have power to do all that is necessary or desirable, in the way of mitigating any hardship that can be inflicted in the case of tenants against whom ejectments are pending for non-payment of rent; and one of those functionaries, since the rejection of Mr. Parnell's Bill, actually announced that, if tenants served with ejectments came into his court, he would give them "fair and reasonable terms."

As a matter of fact, no County Court Judge, or any other Judge in Ireland, has power to do anything of the kind. All they have power to do is to put a stay on the execution of the eviction decree for a few months. In other words, they can postpone the day of eviction; but they cannot prevent it coming some time, and they cannot wipe off or reduce by a farthing the rent-debt on account of which the ejectment is brought, and which will become only the more difficult to pay with the lapse of time.



The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) **Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill.** By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) **The Orange Bogey.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) **The Chicago Convention.** By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P
- (4) **The Irish Land Crisis.**
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (5) **The "Castle" System.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (6) **The Truth about '98.** By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P.
- (7) **Irish Industries and English Legislation.**
By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (8) **The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.**
By CHARLES DAWSON, EX-M.P.
- (9) **An Irish Judge on the Irish Question.**
With Introduction by J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (10) **Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.**
By ALFRED WEBB.
- (11) **Irish Protestants and Home Rule.**
By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P.
Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- The Elections of 1885.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- Coercion.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

Price One Penny each.

A Word for Ireland. By T. M. HEALY, B.L. Price 1s.

Report on the Present State of the Irish Land Question.
By A LAND VALUER. Price 6d.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms, to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.



Other Tracts in preparation.

No. 5.

The Irish Question.

THE “CASTLE” SYSTEM:

BY

JOHN J. CLANCY, M.A.

M.P. for North Dublin.

LONDON :

THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1886

Price One Penny.

THE “CASTLE” SYSTEM.

PART I.

A SKETCH IN OUTLINE.

THE system under which Ireland is actually governed at the present moment was very well described in outline by Mr. Chamberlain, M.P. for West Birmingham, in a speech delivered by him, at West Islington, London, on the 17th June, 1885.

Mr. Chamberlain on that occasion said :—

“I do not believe that the great majority of Englishmen have the slightest conception of the system under which this free nation attempts to rule a sister country. It is a system which is founded on the bayonets of 30,000 soldiers encamped permanently as in a hostile country (cries of ‘shame’). It is a system as completely centralized and bureaucratic as that with which Russia governs Poland, or as that which was common in Venice under Austrian rule (‘shame’). An Irishman at this moment cannot move a step, he cannot lift a finger, in any parochial, municipal, or educational work, without being confronted, interfered with, controlled by, an English official appointed by a foreign government, and without a shadow or shade of representative authority. I say the time has come to reform altogether the absurd and irritating anachronism which is known as Dublin Castle—to sweep away altogether these alien boards of foreign officials, and to substitute for them a genuine Irish administration for purely Irish business” (cheers).

It may possibly be thought that there is some exaggeration in this description of the “Castle” system, but the words of Mr. Chamberlain were and are strictly true. The Government of Ireland is a pure despotism, under the guise of constitutional forms, and this despotism differs from most other forms of despotism, in that the despots are, in Mr. Chamberlain’s phrase, “foreign officials,” deriving their authority not from the Irish people, but from another nation. To prove this assertion is the object of the following pages.

PART II.

THE REAL GOVERNORS OF IRELAND.

The real governors of Great Britain are the people of Great Britain itself. The British people, by means of the representative system, select their own rulers; and when they become tired of or dissatisfied with any given set of rulers, they can get rid of them at a general election, and put another set in their places.

The Irish people, though nominally living under the same constitution, have no such power. *They* never can select their own rulers, even though they should, as they did at the last two general elections, declare their desire to do so by the voice of five-sixths of their parliamentary representatives. On the contrary, they are supplied with administrators nominally appointed by the Sovereign, but really appointed by the party which may for the time happen to be in a majority in Great Britain. The representatives of Ireland may pass any censure they please on those who administer their affairs; but such a vote has, necessarily, no practical effect. The parliamentary or representative system is in their case a mere mockery.

Take the present state of things by way of illustration.

Five-sixths of the parliamentary representatives of Ireland are Nationalists. According to the theory of the British Constitution they ought practically to appoint the men responsible for the management of Irish affairs. But the men who actually administer those affairs are the delegates, not of the large majority, but of the small minority of the Irish representatives and of the political party in Great Britain with which that minority is in agreement on political questions.

The two chief officials of the government in Ireland are the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary. The former is supposed to represent only the Sovereign, but in reality he, as much as the Chief Secretary, is always a party man. Both at present are Tories. One—Lord Londonderry [commonly called by the mass of the Irish people, Lord Castlereagh, after the chief author

of the Union of 1800, with a view to mark their detestation of the political principles he represents]—was once one of the Orange representatives of the County of Down, and has always been closely connected with the Orange faction in Ulster. Since his appointment to his present office he has, in his replies to “addresses” presented to him, thrown off completely the mask of neutrality becoming a representative of the Queen, and openly declared himself again and again a partisan of the “Unionist” or loyalist, that is, Orange complexion. The other and the more important of the two chief members of the “Irish” government—Sir Michael Hicks-Beach—is an English Tory, who could not possibly secure election to Parliament in any one of the eighty-five National constituencies of Ireland, and who would probably find considerable difficulty in obtaining a seat for any one of the remaining eighteen. No two men have ever more clearly held office in despite of the people whom they govern.

DESPOTS AND SOMETHING MORE.

The worst of it is that the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary are not merely ordinary despots—that is, officials responsible in no degree to Irish public opinion, or to the criticism or votes of the Irish representatives; but that their power and authority extend to, and are habitually exercised in, every department of Irish administration, down even, in many cases, to the minutest details; so that, as Mr. Chamberlain says, “an Irishman cannot move a step, cannot lift a finger, in any parochial, municipal, or educational work without being confronted, interfered with, controlled by,” them or their agents and appointees. It may be added that those two chief officials are generally utter strangers to the country, and know nothing about its wants.

We shall now proceed to set forth the details of the bureaucratic system—a system like that of “Russia in Poland,” or that of “Austria in Venice”—at the head of which are the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary.

PART III.**THE BIG "BOARDS."**

A great part of the domestic affairs of Ireland is managed by the following bodies :—

- (1) The Local Government Board ;
- (2) The Board of Works ;
- (3) The Board of National Education.

Every member of every one of those bodies is nominated by the Lord Lieutenant, and is responsible, like the Lord Lieutenant himself, not to Irish public opinion, nor to the representatives of Ireland, but to the British Cabinet and the British majority in Parliament. The boards may do what they please, even though all Ireland denounced their proceedings ; and the knowledge that their masters are the ministers in Downing-street, has only too often rendered most of them utterly indifferent to Irish wishes. When their proceedings are criticized at any considerable length by Irish representatives in Parliament, not only are the boards generally backed up by the Chief Secretary, or some other member of the government, but the Irish members are accused of obstruction, and are threatened with various parliamentary pains and penalties for presuming to "waste the time of the House," by making such criticisms.* This fact has the effect of making the boards not only indifferent to Irish opinion, but too often insolent in their treatment of the individual Irishmen with whom they come in contact.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

The Local Government Board consists of five persons, viz. :— the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who, as we have already pointed out, is not responsible to Irish opinion, and who, indeed, always

* Last session—that which commenced in August of the present year—Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, the new Chief Secretary for Ireland, made a bitter complaint, that amounted to a charge of obstruction, because the debate on the vote for the Local Government for Ireland occupied three hours of the time of the House of Commons !

holds his place in defiance of Irish opinion ; and the permanent Under-Secretary for Ireland and three other members who, as we have also pointed out, are *nominated by the irresponsible Lord Lieutenant*.

The functions of those officials are multifarious and important. Amongst other things, they control the administration of the laws regarding the relief of the poor, the public health, the pollution of rivers, the diseases of cattle, the providing of houses for agricultural labourers, and other matters ; and through their auditors exercise a large control over the proceedings of every town council in the country. Even in the very constitution of new town boards the Local Government Board has a potent voice. For instance, whereas before 1854 it rested with those most concerned —namely, the ratepayers—to say what should be the number of members of each such board, the irresponsible Dublin officials have had that power since. The Boards of Poor Law Guardians, even if they were free from the dominion of the Castle, would be bad enough specimens of representative local government ; *for a full half of every one of those boards is, as we shall point out later on, composed of men virtually nominated by the Lord Lieutenant*, while the “representative” half is elected on a franchise under which *a landlord may have as many as thirty-six votes and the average tenant only one*. But they must be accounted mere mockeries of representative institutions when it is added, that in almost everything they do, they may be “confronted, interfered with, controlled by, an English official appointed by a foreign government, and without a shadow or shade of representative authority.” A few irresponsible men, sitting in the Custom House, Dublin, may refuse to approve the “minutes” of their meetings, they may set aside their resolutions, they may dismiss their officers by “sealed orders,” they may even dismiss and dissolve the local boards themselves—every one of them—and appoint paid guardians of their own nomination to their posts ; and, moreover, all those powers are actually exercised from time to time.

A notable, but by no means, a singular exemplification of the powers of the Local Government Board, and of the manner in which it exercises them on occasions, is furnished by the case of Dr. J. E. Kenny, M.P. for South Cork. Dr. Kenny was medical officer to the North Dublin Union Workhouse, and in that capacity, had won through many years the approbation of all classes of the Dublin public. But he was an ardent Nationalist and Land Leaguer too, and after the suppression of the League in 1881, he was one of those who were arrested as "suspects" on the late Mr. W. E. Forster's warrant, put into Kilmainham Prison, and kept there for several months, not only without trial or conviction, but without any specific charge having ever been brought against them. The Poor Law Guardians of the North Dublin Union esteemed him so highly, that they resolved to keep his place vacant for him and to appoint a *locum tenens* till he should be released from jail. But the very man who had him arrested on suspicion, made his arrest the pretext for calling on the members of the Local Government Board to dismiss him, and dismissed Dr. Kenny accordingly was by "a sealed order," in spite of the guardians! This attempt to ruin a political opponent was so outrageously unjust and arbitrary, that a storm of indignation was aroused, before which the Government eventually gave way, and agreed to the restoration of Dr. Kenny to his liberty and to the professional post of which he had been deprived; but even in the very reversal—a lordly reversal—of its act, the Local Government Board gave a striking instance of its supremacy over the local representatives of the people.

What is true of the Boards of Guardians is true also of the case of the Local Sanitary Boards, which work the Public Health Acts and the Labourers' Acts. The Local Government Board may, if it pleases, obstruct or even render altogether nugatory the operation of those acts, and yet it never can be called to account by the Irish people if their British masters stand by them and defend them, as they usually do.

The powers of the Local Government Board auditors are

extensive and far-reaching ; and they, too, of course, are practically irresponsible to Irish public opinion.

THE BOARD OF WORKS.

The Board of Works consists of three persons, *all of whom are nominated by the Lord Lieutenant.*

It has great powers, and its range of operations is most extensive. Amongst other things, it controls the construction of all public works, the lending of money to landlords and tenants for making improvements on lands, and the management of several harbours and public parks.

Even in cases where its powers seem to be restricted by the existence of local, representative authorities, under or in conjunction with which it is supposed to work, the irresponsible officials, appointed by the irresponsible Viceroy, and not the representatives of the people, have the real authority. Thus, under an Act of 1842 (5 & 6 Vic. c. 89), 121 areas were constituted districts for the purposes of arterial drainage, and local elected boards were called into existence for the management of certain details. This looked at first sight like conceding to Ireland a certain, though small, amount of genuine local self-government ; but the old local drainage boards possessed but the shadow of power ; for the one thing of which they were given no control, and over which the Board of Works had supreme control, was the expenditure of money ! The Board of Works has less power over the new Drainage Boards, but it can still interfere effectively at every stage of their proceedings and defy their protests.

Not a year passes in which serious complaints are not made of the manner in which the Board of Works discharges its multifarious duties ; but whether those complaints are ill-founded or well-founded, the result is almost always the same. The board is not responsible to the Irish people, and its real masters almost invariably take its side in any dispute it may have with any section of the Irish people. Again and again its proceedings have been censured in the House of Commons, by the votes of a large

majority of the Irish representatives; but on those occasions the minister of the day has always stood by it, in opposition to the Irish majority; and at his bidding the votes of the Irish members have been regularly overdone by the intervention of an adequate host of English and Scotch members, who, it may be said without offence, know nothing, as a rule, about the question in dispute.

THE BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

The Board of National Education or, as it is popularly called, the National Board, controls all the primary schools in Ireland maintained by public funds. It prescribes the school regulations under certain limits set by statute; it prepares, or has had prepared under its direction, all the school books; it divides with the local managers of the several schools the control of the teachers; and it is the master of the inspectors.

This important body, dealing with matters that are of the highest interest and deepest possible concern to the people, is wholly independent of the people. It consists of twenty members, *all of whom are nominated by the irresponsible Lord Lieutenant.*

Of the twenty members of the Board, ten are Catholics, and ten are members of various Protestant churches. This arrangement is an illustration of the sort of “religious equality” which even still prevails in many departments of the public service in Ireland. Obviously, if the Catholics of Ireland were to have Commissioners in proportion to their numbers in the country, they should have more than ten, seeing that they are not merely half of the population, but nearly four to one. Yet, they have never asked for any increase in the number of Catholic Commissioners.

Of the twenty, scarcely one is in agreement with the political aspirations of five-sixths of the Irish people. The only two who are not notoriously opposed to the national demand for a domestic legislature, are Mr. Edmond Dease and Mr. C. T. Redington; and, while the Queen’s County had to get rid of Mr. Dease as a parliamentary representative, because of his lukewarmness in

the cause of Home Rule, Mr. Redington gave his adhesion to the project of a statutory parliament for Ireland only after the introduction of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, and because, as he said, he saw that such a settlement of the Irish question was inevitable. One of the anti-national members of the Board is no other than the Rev. Hugh Hanna, about whom so much has been heard in connection with riots in Belfast. It will therefore not surprise the reader to learn that the education imparted in the national schools of Ireland has about it nothing of a patriotic caste. In every free country the children in the public schools are compelled to learn much about their country, and are thus brought up with a love for it, and a desire to serve it; in Ireland the object, so far as the government public schools are concerned, is to teach as little as possible on the subject of Ireland. Two or three years ago, the National School Teachers held their annual congress in Dublin for the discussion of their grievances, and invited to their meetings, amongst other members of parliament, two or three of the leaders of the Irish Party. One or two of these latter accepted the invitation, and delivered speeches in which the pay of the teachers was contrasted with that of the police. Because of this fact, the Board showed its political leanings, by actually attempting to break up the teacher's organization which was itself strictly non-political!

The National Board, of course, like the Local Government Board and the Board of Works, cares nothing and need not care anything for Irish criticism.

OTHER BOARDS.

The other principal Boards in Ireland are :—

- (1) The Fisheries' Board ;
- (2) The Intermediate Education Board ;
- (3) The Board of Asylums for Lunatic Poor ;
- (4) The Prisons Board ;
- (5) The Board of Charitable Donations and Bequests ;
- (6) The Loan Fund Board.

Every member of every one of those Boards also is nominated by the irresponsible Lord Lieutenant; and not one member of any of them is, as such, responsible to, or under the control of, the Irish people or their representatives. It is this latter fact which constitutes the grievance in the case of this group of Boards. Many of them, if not all of them, would, under Home Rule, consist of nominated members; but then the members of them would be nominated by a minister responsible to the Irish people, and would be thus indirectly, but most completely, within the control of the Irish people. Nominated, as they are, by a minister not responsible to or depending on the majority of the Irish representatives for his official existence, they are outside Irish control, and need not, as most of them do not as a matter of fact, care for Irish opinion.

The Fisheries' Board deserves to have it said of it that, if it were responsible to an Irish Parliament, it could not evince a greater desire than it does to discharge its duties to the satisfaction of the Irish people, and with a due regard to the public interests.

PART IV.

THE LORD LIEUTENANT IN THE COUNTIES.

The irresponsible Lord Lieutenant is the chief power in the Irish counties. Through the Lord Chancellor—a political officer like himself, and a dependant, not on Irish, but on British votes for his place—he appoints all the magistrates; he, by that fact also, controls to a great extent the composition of the Boards of Poor Law Guardians; he virtually nominates the Grand Juries; he virtually manages the district lunatic asylums; and, in fact, there is scarcely one department of public business in the counties in which he is not the virtual head and front of everything.

THE MAGISTRATES.

The appointment of magistrates in Ireland--this is the Govern-

ment account of the matter—rests formally with the Lord Chancellor, but really with the Lord Lieutenants of the counties. But these latter are themselves *appointed by the Viceroy in Dublin*; so that, whether the Government theory is correct or not, the truth remains, that the chief authorities in Dublin Castle are the persons virtually and really responsible for the composition of the Irish magistracy.

The result is a striking one. The magistracy of Ireland consists almost entirely of men opposed to the mass of the people in religion, in politics, in everything on which men can differ. In a county where four-fifths of the people are Catholic it has been shown, by a recent parliamentary return, to be a frequent case, that three-fourths of the magistrates are Protestants. Up to a very recent date, *out of 77 magistrates in Fermanagh, there was only one Catholic*; and yet, in that county, though it is in Ulster, the Catholics out-number all the other religious bodies together. The small landlord class alone are, practically speaking, represented on the bench; and thus the scandal is witnessed every year, at the annual licensing sessions, of landlord judges sitting in judgment on liquor dealers who have declined to sell their wares to the agents of evicting members of the landlord fraternity. We do not enter here on the question, whether it is right or wrong to refuse the renewal of their licences to such shopkeepers for such a cause; but justice should be above suspicion, and in the case under consideration, the administration of the law is fatally tainted with the suspicion of glaring partizanship.

But the magistrates not only sit on the bench to “administer justice”; a certain number of them also sit *ex officio* on every board of Poor Law Guardians. Half of every such board must consist of magistrates who need not be and are not elected, but are selected by a rule of law designed to bring to the boards the “biggest” landlords in their respective localities. That is to say, *the Lord Lieutenant, or the “Castle,” virtually nominates half the members of every such board.*

Again, at “baronial sessions,” at which all expenditure in the

baronies out of the Grand Jury cess is authorized, and at the sessions for "the county at large," at which all expenditure out of the same fund is authorized for "the counties at large," the persons entitled to sit and vote are the magistrates for the county, assisted, in the case of the baronial sessions, by a shadowy representation of the cesspayers, who can never number more than twelve, and who in practice—being in a minority—rarely take any part in the business at all. The framers of the statute regulating the matter seem actually to have contemplated this result, for there is a provision that the absence of the cesspayers shall not debar one or more justices from transacting the business of the sessions. *The Lord Lieutenant thus practically nominates all the persons with whom rests the initiation of the expenditure upon all the local works to which the Grand Jury tax is applied, and the cost of which ordinarily amounts to two-thirds of the entire expenditure out of that tax.*

The scandal involved in the composition of the Irish magisterial bench, has long been notorious ; but so far from any real attempt having been made to remove it by appointing more Catholic magistrates and fewer Protestants, the very reverse has been done in recent years. In the six months during which the Tories held office in 1885, about thirty new magistrates were appointed for the County of Dublin. About twenty of those were Protestants, and only about ten Catholics. Yet Dublin is a county in which there is a larger proportion than in any other county, of Catholics of the class usually appointed to the magistracy. The appointments in most of the other counties were of a similar character.

Worse even and more injurious in its effects than the official boycotting of Catholics, is the practice of packing the magisterial bench with members of one class—the class, too, with which the majority of the Irish people have been most in conflict, and which is practically the only one opposed to the national demand for self-government. While in every county there are many merchants, shopkeepers, farmers, and professional men, who are

thoroughly qualified to hold the commission of the peace, these but rarely have a chance of being appointed justices, while not only is every considerable landlord made a magistrate, whether he asks or is fitted for the appointment or not, but his sons are also made magistrates, as a matter of course, as soon as they are of age, and, in many cases, the land agent is appointed in addition. The necessary result is to give a partizan complexion to the bench, and utterly to destroy popular confidence in its impartiality.

THE GRAND JURIES.

The principal local authorities in the counties are the Grand Juries. They are purely landlord institutions and they are non-representative, *being virtually the creation of the Lord Lieutenant.*

The Lord Lieutenant appoints the sheriffs (except in the few corporate towns which have such functionaries); and the sheriffs who are always leading landlords and magistrates, but who need not be and often are not resident in their counties, select the Grand Juries, the only restriction put upon them being one that compels them to favor those landlords who have large property qualifications without any necessary corresponding liability to Grand Jury taxation.* Generally speaking, the sheriff selects from the aristocrats in his county those whom he likes, and if he desires to have the Grand Jury consist entirely of his own personal friends, he has only to place twenty-three of his personal friends at the head of the panel, and have them ready to be sworn when their names are called.

To the bodies selected after this indefensible fashion is entrusted a vast amount of important business, including the appointment of all the county officials, and the repair and maintenance of the public works of the county—its roads, bridges, courthouses, and bridewells. The Grand Juries have the final word in the matter

* It is the tenant and not the landlord who pays the Grand Jury tax.

of sanctioning all county expenditure ; the only remedy which the taxpayers possess against their unjust rulings being a costly appeal to a judge who has no special knowledge of the subjects about which a dispute usually arises.

This is not the worst. The Grand Juries exercise a discretionary power in levying “the blood-money” authorized by various Coercion Acts, and in distributing the cost of the extra police imported into their respective districts at their own request, on the pretext of agrarian disturbances, and supported out of the county to which the landlords, as such, do not contribute. It is a gross scandal that a body of bitter partizans of one party to the agrarian struggle in Ireland should alone have such power ; and it is no wonder that such men often grossly abuse it.

The anomalies of the Irish Grand Jury system are well nigh incredible, and so are the stories of jobbery and corruption which are sometimes told about them ; but even if this system worked as well as it works badly, it is still a monstrous and irritating absurdity that such purely local business should be transacted by bodies of men, *appointed indirectly by an irresponsible official in Dublin Castle, and themselves responsible not even to the Lord Lieutenant.*

But even this is not all. The Grand Juries, which are created by the sheriffs who are appointed by the Lord Lieutenant, not only exercise directly the important powers just referred to, but they themselves in their turn appoint other bodies equally irresponsible. Under the 5 & 6 Vic. cap. 89, for instance, four Inland Navigation Districts were created and placed under “local” control. The local authorities in this case are boards of trustees originally named in the act, but afterwards, on the occurrence of vacancies, appointed by the irresponsible Grand Juries of the counties contributing to the cost.

To sum up the facts on this head. The British cabinet appoints the Lord Lieutenant ; the Lord Lieutenant appoints the sheriffs ; the sheriffs appoint the grand juries ; and the grand juries practically constitute the county-at-large and baronial sessions

courts and the inland navigation boards. The taxpayers, as such, have no power in the matter at all !

MORE OF IT.

The wide-spreading power of the irresponsible Viceroy in Dublin Castle, in the affairs of the Irish counties, has not even yet been fully described.

Ireland is divided into twenty-two Lunatic Asylum districts. In each of those districts is a lunatic asylum. In this case, again, “local” authorities are provided ; but the local authorities in question consists of boards of governors who are *all appointed by the inevitable and irresponsible Lord Lieutenant*. What such sham “authorities” are kept up for at all it is difficult to discover ; *for, not they, but the Lord Lieutenant, appoints the medical officers of the asylums* ; two inspectors, *also appointed by the Lord Lieutenant*, enforce the regulations *which are drawn up by the Lord Lieutenant* for the administration of the asylums ; the Board of Works which, as we have pointed out, is *also the creation of the Lord Lieutenant*, supervises all expenditure in building and structural improvements ; and then, the superfluity is enacted, of making *the Lord Lieutenant the ultimate authority!* The whole arrangement would assuredly be taken to be an elaborate joke, if it were not so certainly a reality.

Take another instance : In Dublin the harbour authority is entitled the Port and Docks Board. This board at least, one would suppose, is one which would be free from the octopus-like claws of the irresponsible Viceroy. But the fact is that it consists of twenty-five members, of whom only three are appointed by the only representative body in the city—namely, the Corporation, while seven are nominated by the Commissioners of Irish Lights, who are themselves *nominated by the Lord Lieutenant*. This Port and Docks Board, it may be added, is authorized to appoint a few quay constables, with limited powers ; but each one of these men must be approved by the Lord Lieutenant, and the Board cannot grant a pension of even half-a-crown

a week to one of its employes without the consent of the Lord Lieutenant !

The Lord Lieutenant everywhere !

PART V.

“LARCOM AND THE POLICE.”

Some years ago, when Sir Thomas Larcom was Under-Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, the government of Ireland was, comprehensively, but with a rough accuracy, described as “Larcom and the Police.” Sir Thomas Larcom gave the orders, and the police executed them. It is pretty much the same now, except, of course, that Sir Thomas Larcom is no longer Under-Secretary. All the departments, being the creations of the chief authority in the Castle, are at the beck of the Under-Secretary, who is at the beck, and acts under the orders, of the Lord Lieutenant—except when, as is the case at present, the Viceroy is a mere figure-head, and the real ruler of Ireland is the Chief Secretary. *The Irish people have no real share whatever in the government of their own country.*

THE POLICE.

The chief agents and support of the British Government in Ireland are, as we have said, the police.

In every part of England, outside London, the police are under local control. In every part of Ireland the police are as much an imperial force as the army, being under the command of an inspector-general in Dublin Castle, who is himself, like every other head of a department, under the control of the Lord Lieutenant or the Chief Secretary. Moreover, outside Dublin, the Irish police are quite as much a military as a civil force, being armed with rifles and swords and regularly drilled and practised in ball-firing like soldiers.

Being free from local, or any Irish control whatsoever, the police have, in the past, habitually conducted themselves—no

doubt in accordance with the orders of their superiors—not as the servants, but as the masters of the public. A village-sergeant of constabulary is a little king or emperor. Is it any wonder if, under these circumstances, the police have not been popular in the past? Yet, under the magic influence of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy, the feeling of dislike towards the police was gradually wearing away (except in Belfast, where it began, on the contrary, to grow amongst the Orangemen), and, no doubt, in a short time, under similar influences, it would have disappeared altogether.

The extent to which the police make themselves felt in Ireland would, no doubt, astonish most Englishmen and Scotchmen. They attend, *fully armed*, at every public gathering of the people—at public meetings, markets, fairs, athletic sports, and races—and at every private meeting for a public object from which they are not expressly excluded by the persons organizing it. Policemen, acting as government reporters—professional gentlemen connected with newspapers, whether nationalist or “loyalist,” not being now available for such unprofessional work—attend every public meeting in the nationalist interest, and demand and are very often accorded seats on the platform. The present writer had occasion to attend some twenty meetings in Dublin county in the years 1883, '4, '5, for the sole purpose of securing the registration of nationalist parliamentary voters, and at almost every one of them a police reporter was in attendance and ostentatiously took a report of the proceedings. The effect was to intimidate a few persons, and make all the rest indignant and more bitterly hostile than ever to English rule. “Loyalist” or Orange meetings, on the other hand, are never attended by government reporters.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

The Privy Council is one of the only other two departments of the autocratic bureau, named Dublin Castle, of which notice need be taken. It is supposed to advise the Lord Lieutenant in

certain cases, and certain executive acts must be done by the Lord Lieutenant “in Council.”

No one would expect this body to be representative ; but its composition, nevertheless, is of a character that must astonish at least some Englishmen. It consists of judges and ex-judges, of about a dozen bitterly anti-Irish peers, of about eight Englishmen (ex-Chief Secretaries), of one or two government officials, and of five of the most unpopular men in all Ireland, every one of whom has been expelled in recent years—all but one, before the recent extension of the franchise—from the Irish Parliamentary representation, and who could not now be elected to the House of Commons in any part of Ireland. Two of these persons were appointed to the Privy Council after they had been defeated at a Parliamentary election, as if to insult the Irish people by honouring men in whom, as public persons, important sections of the Irish people had refused in the most striking fashion to place confidence.

THE STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES.

It remains to say a word about the Stipendiary, or, as they are generally called, the Resident Magistrates in Ireland.

After all that has been said, it need hardly be mentioned that those officials are *appointed by the Lord Lieutenant*. In “Journals” of the late William Nassau Senior, the late Lord Rosse, and other Irish authorities of same stamp, are represented as giving a most disparaging account of the appointments to this office in former days. The character of the appointments is said to have improved of late years ; but, even still, a common practice is to appoint to this magisterial office military men, as if the Irish people were some semi-savage tribe in a newly-conquered country and required to be dealt with in the stern spirit of martial law. During the coercion *regime*, a brace of those resident magistrates used to be the ordinary tribunal in cases of summary jurisdiction, and numberless, and, in many cases, well-founded allegations, were made of the outrages on justice per-

petrified by those tribunals. On the other hand, it must be admitted that, if there were no resident magistrates in some parts of Ireland, such as the Orange districts of Ulster, justice could never be secured for the Catholic and Nationalist section of the population, seeing that “the Stipendiaries” in those places are almost the only magistrates not members of Orange Lodges or steeped to the lips in Orange prejudices. But, passing by the manner in which the resident magistrates have discharged, or are discharging, their duties, we come to the point to which we chiefly wish to direct attention, namely—that “*the Castle*” *has all the appointments to the office in its hands; that it can, if it pleases, turn this power to the most infamous uses; and that in doing so, it need not care for Irish public opinion, seeing that it is backed by British ministers and British votes.*

It should be added that the resident magistrates, besides dispensing “justice,” are amongst the chief advisers of the government in determining their executive policy.

JURY-PACKING.

An essential feature of the “Dublin Castle” system, which appears prominently in times of disturbance, is the jury-packing which is practised in prosecutions for agrarian and political offences. This subject can only be very briefly touched here, as the administration of justice in Ireland is a subject deserving of special treatment. But one or two words about it cannot be omitted in any publication dealing with “the Castle.”

The state of things existing before Lord O’Hagan’s Jury Act, which was passed about 1872, may be illustrated by an incident related in the report of the evidence taken by the Westmeath Committee of the House of Commons, in April, 1871. Mr. Stephen Seed, Crown Solicitor for the Counties of Meath and Kildare, was under examination, and was telling how he had manipulated a Meath jury panel in the June of the previous year. “I had a consultation,” he said, “at the Castle with the Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General was quite shocked,

as well he might be, when I handed him the panel for the special commission of Meath. He said to me—‘ What do you say to this?’ I said, ‘ *Leave the matter to me, I will select a jury!*’” The matter was left to Mr. Seed, and he, in conjunction with some local officials, did “select” a jury, which worked to his satisfaction ! The impropriety of the prosecutor selecting his tribunal does not seem to have struck Mr. Seed at all.

Since Lord O’Hagan’s Jury Act, the government method of “selecting” a jury is less direct. The sheriffs can no longer constitute a panel as they please ; but when a jury is being constituted the prosecutors have an unlimited right of ordering any person to whom they object to “stand aside,” and of thus leaving to be sworn only those to whom they do not object ; and that right has been habitually exercised in recent years in all cases of importance with some striking results.

In 1882, several trials took place in Dublin at which jury-packing of the most flagrant description was practised by means of the power of the Crown prosecutors to order jurors to “ stand aside.” The “ panels” from which the jurors were to be selected consisted of men usually summoned on special juries—that is, they were possessed of high property qualifications, or were highly rated to the relief of the poor. Taken together, they included the names of 112 Protestants, 80 Catholics, and one Jew. In one trial 18 Catholics were set aside, and 2 Protestants ; the result being *an exclusively Protestant jury*. In another trial, 22 Catholics—all whose names were called—were set aside, and 4 Protestants ; the result being *a jury composed of 11 Protestants and one Jew*. In a third, 11 Catholics were ordered aside and 9 Protestants ; the result being *a jury of 12 Protestants*. In a fourth, two Protestants were set aside and 15 Catholics ; the result again being *a jury of 12 Protestants*. For details of these cases the reader is referred to a parliamentary return ordered by the House of Commons, on the 21st November, 1882. Because attention was called to these and other matters in the *Freeman’s Journal* at the time, Mr. E. Dwyer Gray, M.P., the proprietor of the paper,

and then High Sheriff for the City of Dublin, was brought up before the presiding judge on a charge of contempt of court, and was sentenced to pay a fine of £500, to undergo a term of three months' imprisonment, and at the end of that term to give security for his good behaviour, or to go to jail for a further period of three months.

PART VI.

C O N C L U S I O N .

It will now, we think, be seen that Mr. Chamberlain's description of the Dublin Castle system of government is not one whit exaggerated. Under this system, not an atom of real power in any important matter of purely domestic concern is left in the hands of the Irish people. All such power is vested in “foreign officials,” as Mr. Chamberlain would describe them—in men who, though many of them are Irishmen, are most of them anti-Irish in heart and mind; who are mostly Tories, no matter whether the government be Whig or Tory; and who have and know they have their real masters in Downing-street, London. In general practice, this Tory gang are the masters, and the government the tools; for it is on their advice that the government act, and their advice is worth more in the eyes of the government than that of the whole body of Irish representatives put together. No nation with any self-respect would willingly endure a system of government of this kind, and the Irish are no exception to the rule. It is hoped and believed that the English people will not, when they know the nature of this system, continue to force it on Ireland, by the aid—to borrow again the words of Mr. Chamberlain—“of the bayonets of 30,000 soldiers.”

The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) **Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill.** By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) **The Orange Bogey.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) **The Chicago Convention.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P.
- (4) **The Irish Land Crisis.**
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (5) **The "Castle" System.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
The Elections of 1885. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
Coercion. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.
By CHARLES DAWSON, Ex-M.P.
The Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.
By ALFRED WEBB.
Price One Penny each.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms, to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.



Other Tracts in preparation.

NO. 6.

The Irish Question.

THE TRUTH ABOUT '98:

BY

J. E. REDMOND, M.P.

Barrister-at-Law.

LONDON :
THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1886

Price One Penny.

THE TRUTH ABOUT '98.

INTRODUCTION.

THE necessity of going back upon some of the darkest and most disgraceful pages of the history of English rule in Ireland, has been forced upon the advocates of Home Rule by the deliberate policy of suppression and misrepresentation adopted by their opponents. Anything like an honest appeal to history has been avoided by our enemies, and every allusion to the wrongs inflicted upon Ireland by her English rulers has been denounced as a profitless and malicious attempt to rake up a hateful and forgotten past. At the same time that they have demanded the charity of silence and oblivion for the wrong-doings of the English ruling class, they have at considerable pains unearthed from history every instance of cruelty, or bigotry, or injustice on the part of the Irish people, which might be calculated to injure their present demand for autonomy. Such attempts to create anti-Irish prejudice in England must be met, and they can only be met, by that process of going back on the past, which the opponents of Home Rule deprecate so much, but which nevertheless they so constantly resort to themselves, as we have said, when it suits their ends.

Besides, it is impossible to understand the Irish question of to-day without a knowledge of the history of the past, and it is the duty of the people of England resolutely to face the disagreeable task of learning how largely English misrule and English oppression, in bygone days, are responsible for existing Irish misery, poverty, and disaffection. At any rate, before deciding finally on the question of the Legislative Union between the two countries, it is the duty of Englishmen to study closely

the history of the transactions which marked the closing days of the last century, and to try to understand the primary causes of Irish discontent prior to the Union, as well as the means whereby that Union was brought about. Without the knowledge which would be derived from such a study of the past, the meaning of Irish disloyalty and the very nature of the present Irish question must remain to the ordinary Englishman an insoluble problem.

In the carrying of the Legislative Union of 1800, the Insurrection of 1798 played an important part, and as an explanation of the hatred of generations of the Irish race for England and English rule, its history is of the utmost value at the present moment.

There is another reason why this particular chapter of Irish history should form the subject of study and inquiry. At the last election our enemies scattered broadcast throughout Great Britain exaggerated and sensational accounts of certain deeds of atrocity perpetrated by some of the peasantry during the insurrection, together with woodcuts from Cruikshank's pictures, and represented the rising as having been a purely Catholic one, unprovoked in any way by those in authority, and marked all through by deeds of shocking brutality perpetrated upon the Protestant population of the country.

It is the object of these pages shortly to lay the true story of the Insurrection of 1798 before the public, and to show that in no sense could it be said to be a Catholic rising ; that it was deliberately provoked as part and parcel of a settled plan to enable the Union to be carried ; that the people were goaded into open resistance by unutterable cruelties of every kind, practised upon them by a barbarous soldiery and a bloodthirsty Irish faction ; and that the outrages perpetrated by the people, though not in any way to be palliated, were not unnatural acts of retaliation, and in number were few indeed compared with the outrages perpetrated by those in authority. Finally, it is intended to prove these grave accusations as far as possible from the writings of English statesmen and historians whose authority cannot be called in question by anyone.

PART I.

“MR. PITT DID IT.”

WHEN, during the discussion of the Home Rule Bill in the House of Commons, one of the leaders of the Ulster Orange party stated that the Rebellion of 1798 was produced by the action of the Irish Parliament, he was interrupted by Mr. Gladstone who vehemently asserted that “Mr. Pitt did it.” The accusation was an indictment of the whole Irish policy of Mr. Pitt of the gravest character, and it furnished in four words the key to the otherwise inexplicable puzzle, which the policy of the English Cabinet from 1794 down to the Union presents to the student of history, “Mr. Pitt did it.” The English minister deliberately shaped his policy so as to render the spread of disloyalty in Ireland inevitable, and he knowingly permitted the people to be forced into open insurrection, by the intimidation and cruelty of the ascendancy faction and by the oppression of a lawless and abandoned soldiery. Mr. Pitt’s policy was clearly defined in his own mind before 1794. He had arrived at the conclusion, which to-day seems plain enough to everybody who is acquainted with the facts, that the government of Ireland by the methods which then were in force could not continue. The one great danger against which he desired to guard was separation from England, and separation he regarded, and rightly so, as absolutely inevitable unless one of two courses were adopted. Either Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform should be granted and disaffection thereby disarmed, or the very existence of Ireland as a nation should be destroyed and a legislative union established. It seemed for one brief moment as if the first and more generous policy had received his sanction; but it soon became evident that on the contrary he had decided in favour of a union, and that his apparent adoption of the policy of conciliation was in reality part of the plan formed for the accomplishment of the base and evil designs to which he had in his own mind committed himself.

He well knew that in quiet times the proposal of a Legislative Union would be met with a storm of popular indignation ; but, after the suppression of an unsuccessful rebellion, things, he believed, would be different. He saw sectarian hatred gradually softening ; he knew that the union of Irishmen of different creeds would be fatal to his scheme ; and a rebellion in which, if possible, Catholic should be pitted against Protestant, became in his eyes more than ever necessary to success. After such a rebellion, he anticipated that the bulk of the Protestants, fresh from a bitter and exhausting struggle, would be glad to rush into the arms of England for protection, and would accept the Union. The Catholics, on the other side, regarding the obtaining of Emancipation from the hands of an exasperated and terrified Protestant faction as no longer possible, would also, he expected, consent to a Union, in the hope that the English Parliament would give them their rights.

To have deliberately planned an insurrection, in order to suppress it in the blood of the people ; to have allowed the people to be goaded into rebellion and then to have used that rebellion as a means of intensifying hatred between men of different religions in the same land ; to have widened and deepened the chasm between the mass of the people and the dominant class, in order to degrade and injure both ; and to have done all this in order to smooth the way for the carrying of a great measure like the Legislative Union, which professed to be a treaty voluntarily entered into by both nations—all this was an infamy too great to be attributed to any man lightly or without convincing evidence.

Yet this is the accusation gravely brought against William Pitt, in relation to the Rebellion of 1798, and the Union of 1800, by Mr. Lecky, the chief reputable historian of the present day who sides with the “Paper-Unionists.”

MR. LECKY'S TESTIMONY.

In speaking of the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, in 1795, Mr. Lecky says, in his *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland* :—

“It is probable that he [Pitt] was already looking forward to the Union. The steady object of his later Irish policy was to corrupt and degrade, in order that he ultimately might destroy the legislature of the country. Had Parliament been a mirror of the national will, had the Catholics been brought within the pale of the constitution, his policy would have been defeated. By raising the hopes of the Catholics almost to certainty, and then dashing them to the ground ; by taking this step, at the very moment when the inflammatory spirit engendered by the Revolution had begun to spread among the people, Pitt sowed in Ireland the seeds of discord and bloodshed, of religious animosities, and social disorganization, which paralyzed the energies of the country, and rendered possible the success of his machinations.

“*The Rebellion of 1798, with all the accumulated misery it entailed, was the direct and predicted consequence of his policy.* Having suffered Lord Fitzwilliam to amuse the Irish people by the prospect of Emancipation, he blighted their hopes by recalling him, and thus produced the Rebellion.”

SIR JONAH BARRINGTON'S TESTIMONY.

The same charge is preferred against Pitt by Sir Jonah Barrington—a member of the ascendancy faction—in his *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*. He says, in speaking of the Rebellion :—

“Mr. Pitt's end was answered. He raised the Catholics to the height of expectation, and by suddenly recalling their favourite Viceroy, he inflamed them to the degree of generating the commotions he meditated, which would throw the Protestants into the arms of England for protection, whilst the horrors would be aggravated by the mingled conflict of parties. Having sent Lord Fitzwilliam to Ireland with unlimited powers to satisfy the nation, Mr. Pitt permitted him to proceed until he had unavoidably committed himself, both to the Catholics and the country, when he suddenly recalled him. The day Lord Fitzwilliam arrived peace was proclaimed throughout all Ireland. The day he quitted it she prepared for insurrection. Within three months Lord Clare had got the nation into full training for *military execution*. *Mr. Pitt decided upon forcing a premature insurrection for a particular object, and did not calculate the torrents of blood that would be shed, and the inveterate hatred that might be perpetuated against the British government.*”

That this really was the design of Pitt we have the most convincing proof.

LORD FITZWILLIAM'S TESTIMONY.

Lord Fitzwilliam has left it upon record, that he solemnly warned the government what the result of their policy would be. "To disappoint the hopes of the Catholics," said he, "would be to raise a flame in the country that nothing but force of arms could keep down."

But Pitt was not content even with sowing the seeds of disloyalty by his sudden withdrawal of Fitzwilliam; he "took measures" to make the immediate outbreak of rebellion certain.

LORD CASTLEREAGH'S TESTIMONY.

Upon this point we have the words of Castlereagh himself, that "*measures were taken to secure the premature outbreak of the Rebellion.*"

LORD CAMDEN'S TESTIMONY.

Lord Camden, who had supreme charge of the business of goading the people into rebellion, afterwards admitted in the House of Lords, that "*the measures of the Government caused the Rebellion to break out sooner than it otherwise would,*" and the secret committee of the English House of Lords, which subsequently inquired into all the circumstances of the rising, stated in their report:—

"It appears from a variety of evidence laid before your committee, that the *Rebellion would not have broken out as soon as it did, had it not been for the well-timed measures adopted by the Government.*"

What these "measures" were we shall, later on, have occasion to show.

Having thus briefly established the preliminary proposition that "Pitt did it," we shall proceed to trace the causes of the Rebellion step by step, to show its true character, and to consider what share of shame for the misery and outrage, which followed in its wake rightfully rests upon the fame of the people of Ireland.

PART II.

HOW THE REBELLION WAS MADE CERTAIN.

In order to have a just appreciation of the causes which led to the Rebellion, it is necessary to trace, step by step, the principal events which marked the history of Ireland from the Declaration of Independence in 1782, down to the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam in 1795.

After a long and patient struggle, inspired by the genius and guided by the wisdom of Henry Grattan, Free Trade had been obtained, and the Repeal of Poyning's Act left the Irish Parliament free to legislate for Ireland. The English Parliament passed an Act of Renunciation (23 Geo. III. c. 78), which declared that "the right claimed by the people of Ireland—to be bound only by laws enacted by his Majesty and the Parliament of that kingdom—shall be, and it is hereby declared to be, established and ascertained for ever, and shall at no time hereafter be questioned or questionable." Thus the foundation was laid of a free and prosperous nation.

But this was, after all, only the beginning. The Parliament, whose independence had thus been secured, was itself corrupt and venal, and in no sense could be said to represent the people. Grattan, whose own nature was entirely free from guile, gave to the English statesmen of the time credit for a good faith which never animated them. At the very moment when the English Parliament was declaring that the right of Ireland to self-government was at no time henceforward "to be questioned or questionable," English statesmen were deliberately plotting to carry an Act of Legislative Union.

THE UNION PLANNED IN 1782.

Conclusive evidence of this fact is forthcoming in a letter written by the Duke of Portland to Lord Shelburne, on the 6th of June, 1782, in which he said :—

“I have the best reason to hope that I shall soon be enabled to transmit to you the sketch or outline of an Act of Parliament to be adopted by the legislatures of the respective kingdoms, by which the superintending power and supremacy of Great Britain in all matters will be effectually acknowledged.”

And on the 9th of June Lord Shelburne wrote in reply :—

“No matter who has the merit, let the two kingdoms be one, which can only be by Ireland acknowledging the supremacy to be where nature has placed it.”

A PACKED PARLIAMENT.

English statesmen well knew that the settlement of 1782 could not last without domestic reform. The Parliament was corrupt; the people were enslaved; and the executive was still responsible, not to the people whom they ruled, but to the Parliament of Great Britain. Not only were four-fifths of the Irish people expressly excluded, as Catholics, from representation in Parliament, but of the 300 members of the House of Commons, only seventy-two were really returned by the people, while 123 sat for nomination boroughs, and represented only their patrons. Fifty-three peers directly appointed these legislators, and could also insure by their influence the election of ten others. Fifty commoners also nominated ninety-one members, and controlled the election of four others.

THE PENSION LIST SCANDAL.

In addition to this ready means for corruption, the Pension List was a standing scandal and disgrace. Mr. Lecky, speaking of it, says :—

“The enormity of this grievance is sufficiently shown by the fact, that the money spent in pensions in Ireland was not merely relatively, but absolutely, greater than was expended for that purpose in England; that the Pension List trebled in the first thirty years of George III.; and that in 1793 it amounted to no less than £124,000.”

THE PENAL CODE.

When, besides all this, it is remembered that a Penal Code was in existence against the Catholics, of such a character that Burke

described it as “a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man,” it will be easy to understand that the Legislative Independence of 1782, if not to be followed up by Catholic Emancipation and parliamentary reform, was for the bulk of the Irish people not of that advantage which it otherwise would have been.

OPPOSITION TO REFORM.

To the work of completing the creation of a really free nation Grattan, and a resolute minority of the Parliament, devoted their energies ; but at every turn they were opposed and thwarted by the English ministers, who, steadily keeping their project of Union in view, persistently defeated every attempt at reform.

THE UNITED IRISHMEN.

The spirit of religious toleration and liberality was, however, rapidly spreading amongst the Protestants, especially in the north of Ireland. In June, 1791, the Society of the United Irishmen was established at Belfast, by a number of Protestant gentlemen, amongst the more prominent of whom were Theobald Wolfe Tone and Dr. Neilson. Its object was to secure Parliamentary Reform and complete Catholic Emancipation. Its principles were clearly set forth in the following resolutions adopted at its first meeting :—

“First : Resolved, that the weight of English influence in the government of this country is so great as to require a cordial union among *all the people of Ireland*, to maintain that balance which is essential to the preservation of our liberties and the extension of our commerce.

“Second : That the sole constitutional mode by which this influence can be opposed is by a complete and radical reform of the representation of the people in Parliament.

“Third : That no reform is practicable, efficacious, or just, which shall not include *Irishmen of every religious persuasion*.”

The Society was consequently an open, legal, and constitutional one. It consisted chiefly of Protestants who were under no

obligation of secrecy, and who were merely pledged to promote a union of friendship between Irishmen of every religious persuasion, and to secure a full, fair, and adequate representation of all the people in Parliament. The Society did not aim at and did not desire separation. Satisfactory proof of this is forthcoming in what Mr. Lecky, now a leading "Unionist," calls "the clear and evidently truthful memoir of O'Connor, Emmet, and MacNevin when state prisoners." The Society they say, was simply and frankly loyal, aiming solely at Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform, and it was not until the withdrawal of Lord Fitzwilliam, in 1795, that, all hope of their success having disappeared, they became for the first time disloyal. They then began to be convinced "that it would be as easy to obtain a revolution as a reform ; but still the whole body would have rejoiced to stop short at reform."

At first the Society was very successful. Its power rapidly spread. Men of the highest rank and position joined it. Its influence became powerful, both within and without the walls of Parliament. It was leading the Irish people along the only safe path to permanent prosperity, by preaching a union of creeds for a common country. Soon it achieved a remarkable triumph in the passage through Parliament of the Catholic Relief Bill of 1793, which admitted the Catholics to the elective franchise, and which was on all sides welcomed as a prelude to an act of complete emancipation. By degrees the confidence of the people in the future of their country increased, and on all sides the fell spirit of religious animosity seemed rapidly dying out.

Then there occurred an event of the happiest omen for Ireland, as it seemed to those who were unacquainted with the deep designs of Pitt, and who believed in the good faith of English statesmanship. Lord Westmoreland was recalled from the Lord Lieutenancy, and Lord Fitzwilliam was appointed.

LORD FITZWILLIAM'S APPOINTMENT AND RECALL.

This appointment was generally accepted in Ireland as a

conclusive evidence of the triumph of the cause of the people. Mr. Lecky says :—

“Lord Fitzwilliam was one of the most important personages in the Whig party, an intimate friend of Grattan, and a warm and avowed supporter of Catholic Emancipation. Such an appointment at such a moment could only be construed in Ireland in one way. Catholic Emancipation was the pressing question of the hour. Pitt himself asked an interview with Grattan, and stated to him the intended policy of the Government in a remarkable sentence. Their intention was ‘not to bring forward Emancipation as a government measure; but if government were pressed, to yield to it.’ ”

Lord Fitzwilliam arrived in Ireland in December, 1794. He found, as he afterwards stated, that the project of Emancipation was received with “universal approbation on the part of the Protestants ;” and in truth it did seem for one brief moment as if the Irish question were about to be settled once and for all, on the basis of connection with England, coupled with perfect freedom for all classes and creeds in Ireland. But ministers, whose hearts were bent upon quite another kind of “settlement,” speedily dashed the cup of comfort from the lips of Ireland.

Fitzwilliam’s first act was one which aroused against him the fury of the ascendancy faction which for so long a time had preyed upon the very vitals of the country. He dismissed from office Cooke, the Secretary for War, and John Beresford, a Commissioner of Revenue. The people recognized in this act the final proof of the overthrow of their enemies and the triumph of their cause, and popular exultation and excitement were at the highest pitch, when suddenly, without a word of warning or explanation, Pitt abruptly recalled Fitzwilliam, censured him for his encouragement of the Catholic claims, and appointed in his place Lord Camden, whose first act was to restore Cooke and Beresford, and to place the government of the country once more in the hands of the faction whose avowed policy was to suppress all popular liberties and to dragoon the nation.

From that moment the Rebellion became inevitable. The entire character of the Society of the United Irishmen changed. From

being an open it became a secret, from a peaceful it became a revolutionary organization. Its leaders, despairing of securing the liberties of their country by constitutional means, had recourse to the desperate expedients of conspiracy and revolution. The government were well aware of all their plans, and yet they allowed them to proceed. The Rebellion having been rendered inevitable, the next step in their policy was, "to take measures to secure its premature outbreak." The people were to be goaded into open resistance. There then commenced in Ireland a system of outrages upon an unarmed and defenceless people, so horrible that it is difficult at this time in the world's history to believe that such things were possible less than one hundred years ago.

PART III.

HOW "A PREMATURE OUTBREAK" OF THE REBELLION WAS FORCED.

The first effect of Lord Camden's regime was to rekindle throughout the land the smouldering fires of sectarian hatred. Rumours of coming rebellion, of plots to assassinate Protestants, and of wholesale outrages upon the persons and properties of the "loyalist" population, were sedulously circulated. Both Catholics and Protestants were roused to the highest pitch of alarm and consternation. The Orange Society was established to take the place of the "Peep-o'-Day Boys," who for so long had waged a desultory warfare upon the Catholic population of Ulster. At once there commenced a system of atrocious outrages. Walpole, an English Protestant writer of the present day, in his history entitled *The Kingdom of Ireland*, says :—

"The Roman Catholics were attacked indiscriminately. Masters were compelled to dismiss Roman Catholic servants, landlords to dismiss Roman Catholic tenants. Decent farmers, quiet peasants, hard-working weavers, quite unconnected with the Defenders, received notices

‘to go to Hell—Connaught would not receive them.’ Their houses were burned, their furniture broken up, and they and their families driven from their holdings.”

In the County of Armagh particularly this persecution was carried to a pitch that almost exceeds belief. The historian Plowden states that *in that one county alone, in the year 1795, 7,000 men, women, and children were driven from their homes or put to the sword.*

LORD GOSFORD’S TESTIMONY.

Lord Gosford, the Governor of Armagh County, stated in December of that year :—

“Neither age nor sex, nor even acknowledged innocence as to any guilt, is sufficient to excite mercy, much less to afford protection. The only crime which the objects of this ruthless persecution are charged with is simply a profession of the Roman Catholic religion. A lawless banditti have constituted themselves judges of this new species of delinquency, and the sentence they have pronounced is nothing less than a confiscation of all property and an immediate banishment.”

No protection was afforded by the magistrates, “whose sympathies” says Walpole, “were all with the Orangemen, and of whom many were themselves members of the Orange Lodges.”

COERCION ENACTED.

What happened in Armagh was repeated in almost every portion of the country. Parliament reassembled in January, 1796, and in spite of the opposition of Grattan and the patriot party, the government succeeded in carrying into law two Coercion Bills. One (36 Geo. III. c. 6.), entitled an Indemnity Bill, afforded protection to magistrates who had “apprehended suspected persons without due authority, and had sent suspected persons out of the kingdom for his Majesty’s service [*i.e.* in press gangs], and had also seized arms and entered houses, and done divers other acts not justifiable by law.” The other (36 Geo. III. c. 20), entitled an Insurrection Bill, gave unlimited powers to magistrates to arrest and imprison without trial

suspected persons, enacted a Curfew Law, and generally placed the country in a state of siege. A Habeas Corpus Suspension Act was then passed, Martial Law was proclaimed, and Ireland was handed over “bound hand and foot,” as Mr. Chamberlain would say, to the tender mercies of the ascendancy faction.

MARTIAL LAW.

Walpole describes the condition of the country in this state of things, as follows :—

“ All the safeguards of the constitution having been suspended, numbers of persons were taken up on suspicion, flung into gaol, and refused bail. Spies and informers were the only witnesses, and of these the government had a whole army in their pay. The prisons overflowed, guard-houses and barracks were filled with political suspects, and, worst of all, no discipline was maintained among the soldiery, who were allowed to commit all kinds of excesses, and to abuse and maltreat the people. The yeomanry, which had been called out, was composed almost entirely of Orangemen, and these with militia regiments sent over from England, were encouraged to play havoc with the miserable inhabitants. A Welsh mounted yeomanry corps, named the Ancient Britons, under the command of Sir Watkin Williams Wynne, were especially notorious for their brutal violence. Houses were plundered and burned, women outraged, and children brutally ill-treated and murdered. Men were seized and sent on board tenders untried. They were flogged, ‘picketed,’ and half hung* to extort confessions. They

* “Half-hanging,” “pitch-capping,” and “picketing” are constantly referred to in accounts of the Insurrection as being inflicted upon the unfortunate peasantry by soldiers, militia, and yeomanry. It may be necessary to specify these forms of torture. “Half-hanging” brought all the horrors of death without death and immunity from further earthly trials. When the unhappy victim had hung for a short time he was “cut down,” and allowed to come to life again. “Pitch-capping” consisted in pouring hot pitch upon the head, allowing it to cool; and then rudely tearing off the “cap” thus formed, bringing with it the hair and portions of the scalp. “Picketing” was an awfully painful torture. Pegs, or “pickets,” with their pointed ends uppermost, were driven into the ground. Upon these the victim was held—supporting his whole weight upon the bare soles of his feet—exquisitely sensitive parts of the human frame.

were hunted down and sabred. Villages and whole districts were devastated, and the inhabitants turned out of their homes into the ditch."

SIR RALPH ABERCROMBY'S TESTIMONY.

In December, 1796, much to the chagrin of the Beresfords, Fitzgibbons, Tolers, and Cookes, Lord Carhampton was deprived of the command of the army, which was given to Sir Ralph Abercromby. This general found the condition of the troops desperate. They were billeted in "free quarters" upon private houses all over the country. They were utterly without discipline, and were rapidly driving even the most peaceably inclined of the peasantry into open rebellion by atrocities of every kind. In one of his letters, Sir R. Abercromby says, speaking of the conduct of the soldiery whom he had been sent to command :—

"Houses have been burnt by them, men murdered, others half hanged. Within these twelve months every crime, every cruelty that could be committed by Cossacks or Calmucks, has been committed here."

He made a humane effort to mitigate the horrors of the situation ; but he misunderstood the nature of the work he was expected to accomplish in Ireland, as he soon found to his cost. In February, 1797, he issued a general order to the army, in which, after alluding to the "irregularities in the conduct of the troops" and to "the state of licentiousness which must render them formidable to every one but the enemy," he called upon the officers to maintain order. This order gave great offence to the Ascendancy party, and they immediately clamoured for his dismissal. The Viceroy tried to induce him to withdraw the order, but he remained firm, and eventually was forced to resign his command, which passed into the hands of General Lake, who better understood the work he was expected to do, and was not troubled with inconvenient scruples.

Speaking of the recall of Sir Ralph Abercromby, Lord Holland, in his *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, says :—

"His recall was hailed as a triumph by the Orange faction ; and they contrived at the same time to get rid of Mr. Secretary Pelham, who,

though somewhat time-serving, was a good natured and prudent man. Indeed, surrounded as they were with burning cottages, tortured backs, and frequent executions, they were yet full of sneers at what they whimsically termed the ‘clemency’ of the government.”

“Lord Camden,” wrote Sir Ralph Abercromby himself, after his resignation, “has betrayed the situation of Commander-in-chief ; *he has thrown the army into the hands of a faction, and made it a tool under their direction.*”

How terribly they used their power, and how remorselessly the unfortunate people were driven into rebellion in defence of their lives and their homes, is, we fear, but imperfectly known in Great Britain ; and yet the evidence is to be found in the speeches and correspondence of almost every Englishman of prominence in public life at that time.

LORD MOIRA’S TESTIMONY.

In November, 1797, Lord Moira made an ineffectual attempt to induce the English Parliament to step in between Ireland and her torturers. In the English House of Lords he made a speech in which he drew a dreadful picture of the sufferings of the country. He said :—

“My lords, I have seen in Ireland the most absurd, as well as the most disgusting tyranny that any nation ever groaned under. I have been myself a witness of it in many instances ; I have seen it practised and unchecked ; and the effects that have resulted from it have been such as I have stated to your lordships. I have said that, if such a tyranny be persevered in, the consequence must inevitably be the deepest and most universal discontent, and even hatred to the English name. I have seen in that country a marked distinction made between the English and Irish. I have seen troops that have been sent full of this prejudice—that every inhabitant in that kingdom is a rebel to the British government. I have seen the most wanton insults practised upon men of all ranks and conditions. I have seen the most grievous oppressions exercised, in consequence of a presumption that the person who was the unfortunate object of such oppression was in hostility to the government ; and yet that has been done in a part of the country as quiet and as free from disturbance as the city of London. Who states these things, my

lords, should, I know, be prepared with proofs. I am prepared with them. Many of the circumstances I know of my own knowledge ; others I have received from such channels as will not permit me to hesitate one moment in giving credit to them."

"His lordship then observed that, from education and early habits, the *curfew* was ever considered by Britons as a badge of slavery and oppression. It then was practised in Ireland with brutal rigour. He had known an instance where a mother of a house had in vain pleaded to be allowed the use of a candle to enable the mother to administer relief to her daughter struggling in convulsive fits. In former times, it had been the custom for Englishmen to hold the infamous proceedings of the Inquisition in detestation. One of the greatest horrors with which it was attended was that the person, ignorant of the crime laid to his charge, or of his accuser, was torn from his family, immured in a prison, and in the most cruel uncertainty as to the period of his confinement, or the fate which awaited him. To this injustice, abhorred by Protestants in the practice of the Inquisition, were the people of Ireland exposed. All confidence, all security were taken away. In alluding to the inquisition he had omitted to mention one of its characteristic features. If the supposed culprit refused to acknowledge the crime with which he was charged, he was put to the rack, to extort confession of whatever crime was alleged against him by the pressure of torture. The same proceedings had been introduced in Ireland. When a man was taken up on suspicion he was put to the torture ; nay, if he were merely accused of concealing the guilt of another. The rack, indeed, was not at hand ; but the punishment of picketing was in practice which had been for some years abolished as too inhuman, even in the dragoon service. He had known a man, in order to extort confession of a supposed crime, or of that of some of his neighbours, picketed till he actually fainted, picketed a second time till he fainted again, and, as soon as he came to himself, picketed a third time till he once more fainted ; and all upon mere suspicion ! Nor was this the only species of torture. Men had been taken and hung up till they were half dead, and then threatened with a repetition of the cruel treatment unless they made confession of the imputed guilt. *These were not particular acts of cruelty, exercised by men abusing the power committed to them, but they formed a part of our system.* They were notorious, and no person could say who would be the next victim of this oppression and cruelty, which he saw others endure. If any one was suspected to have concealed weapons of defence, his house, his furniture, and all his property was burnt. But this was not all : if it were supposed that any district had not surrendered all the arms

which it contained, a party was sent out to collect the number at which it was rated ; and, in the execution of this order, thirty houses were sometimes burnt down in a single night.”

MR. FOX AND LORD BEDFORD.

In the English House of Commons, Mr. Fox, and in the House of Lords, Lord Bedford, made similar attempts to save Ireland. Lord Bedford moved a motion for “the immediate stoppage of a system of coercion in Ireland, shocking to humanity, and disgraceful to the British name,” and he asserted that he had “documentary evidence to prove that the cruelties had not been resorted to on the spur of the moment, *but had been deliberately resolved upon long before for a certain purpose.*” But it was all of no use. Pitt was too strong for them, and the merry work of “smoothing the way for the Union” proceeded.

LORD HOLLAND’S TESTIMONY.

Lord Holland, in his *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, adds the weight of his testimony to the foregoing. He says :—

“ It is a fact incontrovertible, that the people were driven to resistance by free quarters and the excesses of the soldiery, which were such as are not permitted in civilized warfare, even in an enemy’s country. Trials, if they may be so called, were frequent under courts-martial, such courts-martial being composed of three officers, two being generally under twenty-one years old, and the third, an Orangeman, who had sworn to exterminate the people over whom he was placed as judge—floggings, picketings, death, the pitch-cap, were the usual sentences.”

And, again, in another part of the same work, Lord Holland wrote :—

“ The measures which led to the Rebellion, suggested by Lord Clare, and by the remorseless faction of Orangemen, who called themselves the Protestant ascendancy, roused the indignation of every man who had a sense of justice or the feelings of humanity. The outrages perpetrated with the sanction of the government excited horror. *The Irish Catholics were goaded into premature hostility.* The insurrection was the chief cause of the Union, by furnishing the English government with both the means and the pretext for accomplishing a measure which in no other circumstances could have been attempted.”

LORD CORNWALLIS'S TESTIMONY.

More remarkable perhaps than any other, and certainly more incontrovertible, is the testimony of Lord Cornwallis, who went to Ireland as Viceroy in June, 1798, and whose correspondence discloses with hideous clearness the brutalities practised by the soldiery and the blood-thirstiness of the ascendancy faction, both in provoking and suppressing the Rebellion.

Writing to the Duke of Portland, on the 28th June, Lord Cornwallis said, with regard to the conduct of the troops :—

“The account you see of the numbers of enemy killed in battle are greatly exaggerated. I am sure that a very small proportion of them could be killed in battle ; and I am very much afraid, that any man in a brown coat, who is found within several miles of the field of action, *is butchered without discrimination.*”

Writing to Major-General Ross, on 9th July, he said :—

“There is no enemy in the field to oppose our troops. *We are engaged in a war of plunder and massacre.*”

And again, on 31st July :—

“Our war is reduced to a predatory system in the mountains of Wicklow.”

In a letter to Major-General Ross, under date 24th July, he wrote :—

“The whole country is in such a state, that I feel frightened and ashamed whenever I consider that I am looked upon as being at the head of it. Except in the instances of the six state trials that are going on here, there is no law either in town or country, but martial-law ; and you know enough of that to see all the horrors of it, even in the best administration of it—judge then how it must be conducted by Irishmen (*i.e.*, Orangemen), heated with passion and revenge. *But all this is trifling compared to the numberless murders that are hourly committed by our people without any process or examination whatever.* The yeomanry are in the style of loyalists in America, only much more numerous and powerful, and a thousand times more ferocious. They take the lead in rapine and murder. The Irish militia, with few officers, and those chiefly of the worst kind, follow closely in the heels of the yeomanry in murder and every kind of atrocity ; and the fencibles take a share, although much behind.”

On the 15th of April, 1799, after the Rebellion had been practically suppressed, he wrote as follows to Major-General Ross, with reference to an accusation of undue leniency made against him by the ascendancy faction :—

“ You write as if you really believed that there was any foundation for all the lies and nonsensical clamour about my leniency. On my arrival, I put a stop to the burning of houses and murder of inhabitants by the yeomen, or any other persons who delighted in that amusement, to flogging, for the purpose of extorting confession, and free quarters, which comprehended universal rape and robbery throughout the whole country.”

THE TACTICS OF THE ASCENDANCY PARTY.

The evidence which Lord Cornwallis’s correspondence supplies of the true character of the ascendancy faction is still more striking. In a letter addressed to the Duke of Portland, on 8th July, 1798, he said :—

“ The principal persons (*i.e.* the *Orangemen*), are in general adverse to all acts of clemency, and although they do not express it, and perhaps are too much heated to see the ultimate effects which their violence must produce, would pursue measures that could only terminate in the extirpation of the greater number of inhabitants, and in the utter destruction of the country. The words Papists and priests are forever in their mouths ; and by this unaccountable folly they would drive four-fifths of the community into irreconcilable rebellion.”

On the 27th July in the same year, he wrote to Major-General Ross as follows :—

“ The conversation of the principal persons (*i.e.* ascendancy caste) of the country, all tend to encourage this system of blood, and the conversation even at my table, where you will suppose I do all I can to prevent it, always turns on hanging, shooting, burning, etc. etc. ; and if a priest has been put to death the greater joy is expressed by the whole company.”

On the same date, writing to the Duke of Portland, he said :—

“ The minds of people are now in such a state, that nothing but blood will satisfy them, and although they will not admit the term, their conversation and conduct point to no other mode of concluding this unhappy business than that of extirpation.”

In September, 1798, he wrote :—

“The principal personages (*i.e.* Beresford, etc.), who have long been in the habit of directing the councils of the Lord Lieutenants, are blinded by their passions and prejudices, talk of nothing but strong measures, and arrogate to themselves the exclusive knowledge of a country, of which, from their mode of governing it, they have, in my opinion, proved themselves totally ignorant. . . . Religious animosities increase, and, I am sorry to say, are encouraged by the foolish violence of all the principal persons who have been in the habit of governing this island.”

In the following year, 1799, when the rising had been to a great extent suppressed, and when his main object was to produce comparative quiet during the discussion of the Union, he still complains of the same ferocity and bloodthirstiness on the part of the Orangemen.

In June, 1799, he wrote to Major-General Ross :—

“The country is becoming every day more quiet ; but the ferocity of the loyalists will not, for a long time, permit the restoration of perfect tranquillity.”

And on the 16th November he made the following remarkable statement :—

“The greatest difficulty which I experience is to control the violence of our loyal friends, who would, if I did not keep the strictest hand on them, convert the system of martial-law (which, God knows, is bad enough of itself) into a more violent and intolerable tyranny than that of Robespierre. The vilest informers are hunted out from the prisons, to attack, by the most barefaced perjury, the lives of all who are suspected of being, or of having been, disaffected, and indeed every Roman Catholic is in great danger. *I attempt to moderate that violence and cruelty, which has once driven, and which, if tolerated, must again drive this wretched country into rebellion.*”

We might multiply, *ad infinitum*, quotations of this character from the letters of Lord Cornwallis. The fact, however, is sufficiently proved by the foregoing, that according to the testimony of the English Viceroy himself, the unfortunate people of Ireland were driven into rebellion by the excesses of the soldiery and by the ferocity of the so-called loyalists of that day.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH'S TESTIMONY.

On this point, the statements of Mr. Goldwin Smith, now a leading "Unionist," are particularly interesting. In his *Irish History and Irish Character*, he says:—

"The Protestant gentry and yeomanry, as one man, became Cromwellians again. Then commenced a reign of terror, scarcely less savage than that of the Jacobins. The suspected conspirators were intimidated, and confessions, or pretended confessions, were extorted, by loosing upon the homes of the peasantry the licence and barbarity of an irregular soldiery, more cruel than a regular invader. Flogging, half-hanging, pitch-capping, picketing, went on over a large district, and the most barbarous scourgings, without trial, were inflicted in the Riding-house, Dublin, in the very seat of government and justice. This was styled 'exerting a vigour beyond the law,' and to become the object of such vigour it was enough, as under Robespierre, to be suspected of being a suspect. . . .

"The peasantry, though undoubtedly in a disturbed state, might have been kept quiet by lenity; *but they were gratuitously scourged and tortured into open rebellion*. . . . These were the crimes, not of individual ruffians, but of a faction—a faction which must take its place in history beside that of Robespierre, Couthon, and Carriere. The murders by the Jacobins may have excited more indignation and pity because the victims were of high rank; but in the use of torture the Orangemen seem to have reached a pitch of fiendish cruelty which was scarcely attained by the Jacobins. . . . The dreadful civil war of 1798 was the crime, as a candid study of its history will prove—not of the Irish people, but of the Orange terrorists, *who literally goaded the people into insurrection*."

A striking confirmation of the statement that the people were driven into insurrection against their will by the organized brutalities of the military, is afforded by the history of the rising in the County of Wexford. It was in this county that the Rebellion became most formidable. For three or four weeks the insurgent troops held undisputed possession of the greater part of the county; they numbered close upon 50,000 men, and they were not defeated until General Lake had collected in front of Vinegar Hill an army of 20,000 trained English soldiers, commanded by no less than 17 general officers. Yet we have it on the best

authority that the conspiracy of the United Irishmen never got a firm footing in Wexford at all ; and in the list of "places to be relied upon," prepared by Lord Edward Fitzgerald, in February, 1798, the name of Wexford does not appear. The people of this county had long been distinguished for their thrift, industry, and peaceable habits. Notwithstanding the risings elsewhere in Ireland, Wexford was, up to the middle of April, 1798, in a state of profound peace. At that time, however, Lord Kingsborough, at the head of the North Cork militia, arrived in the county. The soldiers were billeted on the people, martial-law was proclaimed, and in a month this county, where "the conspiracy" had never taken root, was the scene of a fierce war. The people were forced into the field in defence of their lives, their homes, the honour of their wives and daughters, and their religion.

PART IV.

OUTRAGES BY THE PEOPLE.

That the Rebellion of 1798 witnessed some deeds of cruelty and of outrage on the part of the people, has never been denied by Irish Nationalists, nor has any attempt ever been made by them to palliate those crimes. It is, however, manifestly unfair to parade before the world the deeds of violence committed by the people, and to omit all mention of those which drove them to desperation and madness. That a system of torture and of murder, such as that described in the foregoing pages, could be practised upon a people without leading to acts of savage retaliation, of cruelty, and of horror, can only be believed by those who have but lightly studied human nature. We abhor the crimes which marked the history of 1798, whether committed by the yeomen or the people, and we do not propose in any way to palliate any of them. But we desire the truth to be known, and the truth is that every deed of atrocity committed by the people was an act

of retaliation for atrocities practised upon them by, or at the instigation of, those in authority. No serious effort was made by those in command of the troops to save the people from outrage until the end of the year 1798, when the Rebellion was practically over. On the contrary, as we have seen, Sir R. Abercromby was actually recalled from the chief command, because he ventured to censure the licence and barbarity of the soldiers.

GENERAL ORDERS OF ENGLISH COMMANDERS.

As an instance of the recognized military despotism of the day, the following extract from a proclamation of General Derham in Belfast will be instructive :—

“ And shall it be found hereafter that said traitor has been concealed by any person or persons, or by the knowledge or connivance of any person or persons of this town and its neighbourhood, or that they, or any of them, have known the place of his concealment, and shall not have given notice thereof to the commandant of this town, such person’s house will be *burnt*, and the owner thereof *hanged*.

“ This is to give notice, that if any person is taken up by the patrols after ten o’clock, he will be fined five shillings, for the benefit of the poor. If the delinquent is not able to pay five shillings, he will be brought to a drum-head court-martial, and will receive *one hundred lashes* !

“ JAMES DERHAM, *Colonel-Commandant.*”

The following is copy of a general order issued by the officer in command in Cork, from the “Adjutant-General’s office,” on the 7th May, 1798 :—

“ Whereas, it has been reported to Lieut-General Sir James Stewart, that in some parts of the country where it has been necessary to station troops, at *free quarters*, for the restoration of public tranquillity, that general subscriptions of money have been entered into by the inhabitants, to purchase provisions for the troops ; by which means the end proposed, of making the burthen fall as much as possible on the guilty, is entirely defeated by making it fall in a light proportion on the whole, and thereby easing and protecting the guilty—it has been thought proper to direct, that wherever that practice has been adopted, or shall be attempted, the general officers commanding divisions of the southern district shall

immediately *double, treble, and quadruple* the number of soldiers so stationed ; and shall send out regular foraging parties to provide provisions for the troops, in the quantities mentioned in the former notice, bearing date the 27th day of April, 1798 ; and that they shall move them from station, through the district or barony, until *all* arms are surrendered, and tranquillity to be perfectly restored—and until it is reported to the general officers, by the gentlemen holding landed property, and those who are employed in collecting the public revenues and tithes, that *all rents, taxes, and tithes are completely paid up.*"

General orders of this character were frequent enough ; but not one single order was issued to the soldiery by their commanders, threatening any pains or penalties whatever for deeds of outrage perpetrated upon the people, from the date of the withdrawal of Sir R. Abercromby down to the 31st August, 1798. On the latter date, Lord Cornwallis issued an order, which showed clearly enough what the character of the provocation given to the people during all those months must have been. It ran as follows :—

"It is with great concern that Lord Cornwallis finds himself obliged to call on the general officers, and the commanding officers of regiments in particular, to assist him in putting a stop to the licentious conduct of the troops, and in saving the wretched inhabitants from being robbed, and in the most shocking manner ill-treated by those to whom they had a right to look for safety and protection."

The previous silence of the commanding officers throughout Ireland, in the face of the notorious conduct of their troops, convicts them of complicity in every deed of horror committed upon the peasantry.

GENERAL ORDERS OF REBEL COMMANDERS.

In marked contrast was the action of those who commanded the rebel forces. Whatever atrocities were committed by the people were in direct defiance of the orders of those in authority amongst them, and no attempt has ever been successfully made to hold the rebel leaders responsible. The first general proclamation to the rebel forces was couched in the following terms :—

" Soldiers of Erin, remember your homes ; let the domestic hearth never be violated, nor the arms of the nation sullied by cruelty or revenge.

Bear in mind that the weak and the defenceless claim your protection, and that retaliation is only the weapon of the coward and the slave. Let this be engraven on your hearts, and let it be proclaimed to the extremity of our land, that *insult to female honour, contempt of orders, pillage and desertion, shall be punished with death.*”

The leaders of the rebel army in Wexford issued the following general orders :—

“*Any person or persons who shall take upon them to kill or murder any person or prisoner, burn any house, or commit any plunder, without special written orders from the Commander-in-chief, shall suffer death.*”

By order of

“B. B. HARVEY, *Commander-in-chief.*

“F. BREEN, *Adj.-Gen.*

“*Head-Quarters, Carrick-Byrne Camp.*

June 6, 1798.”

“At this eventful period, all Europe must admire, and posterity will read with astonishment, the heroic acts achieved by a people strangers to military tactics, and having few professional commanders. But what power can resist men *fighting for liberty!*”

“In the moment of triumph, my countrymen, let not your victories be tarnished with any wanton act of cruelty. Many of those unfortunate men, now in prison, were not our enemies from principle ; most of them, compelled by necessity, were obliged to oppose you. . . .

“To promote a union of brotherhood and affection among our countrymen of all religious persuasions, has been our principal object. *We have sworn in the most solemn manner—we have associated for this laudable purpose, and no power on earth shall shake our resolution.*”

“EDWARD ROCHE.

“*Wexford, June 7, 1798.*”

SCULLABOGUE.

In spite, however, of these proclamations, certain deeds of atrocity were committed, and the massacre on the bridge at Wexford and the scene of Scullabogue will never cease to call the blush of shame to the cheeks of Irishmen. The truth, however, of these horrible events robs them of much of their blackness, and shows the utter unfairness of casting upon the Irish people

generally the shame for the deeds of a handful of murderous cowards. The massacre at Scullabogue of loyalist prisoners to the number of about one hundred was the deed of a number of runaways from the battle of Ross, where the rebel troops were defeated. They brought tidings, *which were perfectly true*, that the victorious troops were putting all the rebel prisoners to death, and in a spirit of savage retaliation, the loyalist prisoners in Scullabogue were similarly killed. The rebel leaders were in no way responsible for this deed, and the Commander-in-chief, Baggenal Harvey, immediately afterwards resigned his command, *in a great degree owing to the horror and disgust which the news of this deed inspired in his breast.* Persistent attempts have been made to attribute this deed of horror to Catholic ferocity against Protestants. Nothing could be more absurd, and, as a matter of fact, *fifteen or sixteen Catholics shared the same fate as the Protestants in Scullabogue.*

We repeat that we do not desire to palliate occurrences of this character; but truth compels the assertion that they were no worse than many which resulted from the systematic course of oppression and cruelty pursued by the soldiery, and probably were not nearly as bad as certain massacres perpetrated upon the people in cold blood and apparently with the full approval of the officers in command.

For example, the massacre on the gibbet-rath at Kildare exceeds in atrocity that of Scullabogue. According to Sir Richard Musgrave, whose testimony will not be regarded as that of a man partial to the rebel cause, 3,000 rebels surrendered themselves and their arms to General Dundas on the 26th of May, and on the 3rd June this multitude of unresisting men were suddenly attacked by the troops, and 350 of them slaughtered. Equally horrible was the burning of the hospital at Enniscorthy, where between eighty and one hundred wounded rebels were burned to death by the soldiery.

There is no more reason why the massacre of Scullabogue, taking it at its worst, should be regarded as inflicting a perma-

uent and general stigma of cruelty upon Irishmen, than that the awful atrocities committed in India during the Mutiny (such as the roasting of prisoners alive by native troops under command of British officers), or the flogging of negroes with piano wires during the suppression of a rebellion some years ago in Jamaica, should be regarded as putting a similar stigma upon Englishmen generally and proving their incapacity for self-government.

We have no desire, however, to pursue this matter further. Outrages were perpetrated upon both sides in '98 that were very horrible; but before apportioning the blame between the government and the Orange faction, who between them deliberately goaded the people into insurrection, on the one side, and the tortured and maddened peasantry on the other, the impartial student of history should carefully consider both sides of the story.

WAS THE REBELLION A CATHOLIC ONE ?

It remains to be considered whether the statement of our enemies is true that the Rebellion of 1798 was a Catholic rising. It is clear that, alike in origin and organization, the so-called conspiracy of the United Irishmen was, on the contrary, essentially a Protestant one. Of the 162 leaders of the movement whose names have been handed down to us, no fewer than 106 were Protestants, and only 56 were Catholics. The founders of the Society and the prominent leaders of the Rebellion were almost to a man Protestants. It is true that the rebel forces were chiefly made up of the Catholic peasantry, and that the yeomanry regiments were mostly Orangemen and Protestants; but the question of religion had little or nothing to do with the business. Even in the County of Wexford, which according to Mr. Lecky, "*was the only county where the rebellion was distinctly Catholic*," its chief leaders were Protestant landlords, like Bagenal Harvey, of Bargy Castle, and Beauchamp Colclough, of Tintern Abbey.

Lord Cornwallis, in a letter to the Duke of Portland, dated

28th June, 1798, speaks of "*the folly which has been prevalent of regarding Catholicism as the foundation of the present rebellion;*" and we do not believe that any reliable evidence whatever is forthcoming to prove that the question of religion had anything to do with the Rebellion whatever.

EXPERIENCES OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS DURING THE REBELLION.

There can be no greater proof that the Rebellion (in so far as it was spontaneous on the part of the people) was a rising against tyranny and not against Protestantism, than the fact that the members of the Society of Friends (Quakers) scattered over Ireland passed scatheless through that time. Numbers of that body were settled in the most disturbed districts—more especially between New Ross and Wexford, which was in the occupation of the insurgents for many weeks. They were for the most part settled on lands which had been taken from the people in the previous century under the Cromwellian "settlement." In doctrine and discipline they were the most opposed to Catholics of all Protestant denominations. Yet they lived through the Rebellion unharmed—often in isolated districts—often women and young children alone. Not a single Quaker perished in the strife, except, we believe, one who joined and fought on the yeoman side. The only reasonable explanation for this historical fact is that the Quakers as a body had acted humanely towards their Catholic neighbours, and that they had taken no part in either the religious or territorial system of ascendancy under which Ireland then groaned.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion we hope the light thrown upon the dark history of 1798, by the foregoing pages, will do something to counteract the calumnies against the Irish people which have been scattered by their enemies broadcast throughout Great Britain. We have made no single assertion without citing our authorities, and we have relied entirely upon the writings of English statesmen and

historians whose bias is certainly not in favour of the Nationalist cause. We claim to have proved :—

- (1) That the rising was planned by Pitt in order to facilitate the passing of the Union ;
- (2) That it was rendered absolutely inevitable by the withdrawal of Lord Fitzwilliam ;
- (3) That “measures were then taken to secure the premature outbreak of the Rebellion” ;
- (4) That such measures included the wholesale murder and torture of the people, and the devastation of the country at the instance of the ascendancy faction ;
- (5) That the deeds of outrage by the people, though they cannot be palliated, were yet acts of retaliation, and were much exceeded in atrocity by the systematic barbarity of the soldiery ;
- (6) That the commanders of the rebel army did their best to restrain their troops ; while the only English commander who denounced outrage before September, 1798, was at once deprived of his command at the instance of the Orangemen ; and
- (7) That the rising was in no sense of the word a Catholic one.

We conclude with the expression of the hope that the day is not far distant when we may obtain that “blessed oblivion of the past,” in which, as Mr. Gladstone has said, “England has, if anything, a greater interest than Ireland.”

POSTSCRIPT.

A proof of the foregoing having been submitted to an eminent Protestant clergyman, that Rev. gentleman sent the publishers the following notes, which rest on such unimpeachable authority, and are so much to the purpose, that they are here added by way of a postscript.

A list is preserved of thirty-three Roman Catholic chapels burned in the diocese of Ferns, County Wexford, in the years

1798, 1799, and 1800. The sight of the chapel of Boolavogue in flames, on Whitsunday, 27th May, 1798, finally decided Father John Murphy to join the insurrection, in which he became a leader of ability. Only one Protestant church, that of Old Ross, was burned during the insurrection, 2nd June, 1798, three days before the battle of New Ross.—*Hay's History of the Insurrection of the County Wexford*, Appendix, page 294.

The insurrection broke out on Saturday, 26th May. On the day before “twenty-eight prisoners were taken out of their place of confinement and deliberately shot without trial, in the ball-alley of Carnew, by the yeomen and a party of the Antrim militia.”—*Hay's History*, pages 76 and 87. The Rev. James Gordon, the Protestant Rector of Killegny, in the diocese of Ferns, and who with his family, resided at the time in the County of Wexford, states :—

“I have reason to think that more men than fell in battle were slain in cold blood. No quarter was given to persons taken prisoners as rebels, with or without arms. For one instance—fifty-four were shot in the little town of Carnew in the space of three days.—*Gordon's History of the Rebellion*, page 222.

“In one point I think we must allow some praise to the rebels: amid all their atrocities the chastity of women was respected; I have not been able to ascertain one instance to the contrary. The opposite behaviour towards the female peasantry prevailed among the royal troops on their entering into possession of the country at the retreat of the rebels.—*Gordon's History*, page 213.

“Women and children were not put to death by the insurgents, except in the tumultuous and hasty massacre of Scullabogue.”—*Gordon's History*, page 217.

After the suppression of the insurrection in Wexford, another broke out in the west of Ireland, in consequence of the landing of about a thousand French soldiers, under the command of General Humbert; the inadequacy of the force of this expedition, and the feeble support it was able to obtain, soon led, in about a fortnight's time, to its complete failure. The landing took place at Killala, on the coast of Mayo, 22nd August, 1798; on the 8th

September General Humbert surrendered to Lord Cornwallis. A most interesting narrative of the whole affair was written by the Right Rev. Dr. Stock, the Protestant Bishop of Killala, who was, as he states himself, an eye-witness. From this narrative I take the following extract as to the conduct of the Connaught rebels:—

“When the united weight of so many temptations is duly estimated, operating besides on a body of peasantry already estranged from their Protestant neighbours by differences of religion, language, and education, it will be a matter of surprise that so little mischief was the result of the insurrection in Connaught, and that we had not the same horrid scenes of cruelty and religious intolerance to mourn over, as had lately stamped indelible disgrace on the eastern province. It is a circumstance worthy of notice, that during the whole time of this civil commotion, *not a drop of blood was shed by the Connaught rebels, except in the field of war.* It is true the example and influence of the French went a great way to prevent sanguinary excesses. But it will not be deemed fair to ascribe to this cause alone the forbearance of which we were witnesses, when it is considered what a range of country lay at the mercy of the rebels for several days after the French power was known to be at an end.”—*Bishop of Killala's Narrative*, pages 26-30.

The comment made on this statement of the Protestant Bishop by the Rev. James Gordon, the Protestant Rector, who was an eye-witness of the Wexford rebellion, is extremely weighty:—

“To account in some degree for the small portion of rancour in the western comparatively with the south-eastern insurgents, we are to observe, that in the territories of the former those rigorous measures had not been practised, which government had been forced elsewhere to authorize for the disorganization of the united conspiracy; for surely the free quarterings of soldiers, the burnings of houses, and the infliction of torture to extort confession, together with the unauthorized insults committed by mistaken or pretended zealots for loyalty, as croppings, pitch-cappings and half hangings, must, whether necessary or not, whether deserved or not, be expected to kindle a spirit of revenge in the sufferers and their party.”

The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) **Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill.** By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) **The Orange Bogey.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) **The Chicago Convention.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (4) **The Irish Land Crisis.**
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (5) **The "Castle" System.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (6) **The Truth about '98.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- The Elections of 1885.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- Coercion.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.**
By CHARLES DAWSON, Ex-M.P.
- The Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.**
By ALFRED WEBB.
Price One Penny each.



The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms, to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.

 *Other Tracts in preparation.*

NO. 7.

The Irish Question.

IRISH INDUSTRIES & ENGLISH LEGISLATION:

BY

JOHN J. CLANCY, M.A.

M. P. for North Dublin.

LONDON:

THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1886

Price One Penny.

R. D. Webb and Son, Printers, Abbey-street, Dublin.

IRISH INDUSTRIES & ENGLISH LEGISLATION.

PART I.

INTRODUCTORY.

THE question why Ireland has no manufactures? is often asked in England and Scotland. Many Englishmen and Scotchmen desire, in other words, to know why the people of Ireland are mainly thrown on the land for sustenance.

The following pages are designed to answer this question. They will also explain to a great extent, why English rule has been hated in Ireland.

Mr. Lecky, now a “Unionist,” in his *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, points out that the progress of Scotland, in so far as it is due to legislation, may be chiefly ascribed to four causes—namely, the establishment of the Church of the great majority of the nation, the introduction of an admirable system of parochial education in which all classes could participate, the destruction of the feudal privileges of the Highland chiefs, and, lastly, the removal of all restrictions on commercial and industrial enterprize. Whether all this is true or not may or may not be questionable ; but, as Mr. Lecky adds, in Ireland the course of legislation on all those points was directly the opposite. We are not now concerned with the forcing of the Protestant Church on the Catholics of Ireland, the denial of education to them except on terms which they could not conscientiously accept, or the creation of a hostile aristocracy which was ten times more oppressive to its victims than were the Highland chiefs to their retainers—though it is true that each of these things had a vast deal to do with hindering the material prosperity of the country. Enough for the present to deal with the last-mentioned topic of the series enumerated by Mr. Lecky ; and in reference

to this point we find this fact written in broad and striking characters across the pages of Anglo-Irish chronicles—viz., that the creation of anything like a great Irish industrial class has been absolutely prevented by English legislation. We shall see hereafter how, in modern times, this result has been attained by indirect means; but our attention is first challenged by the earlier method of downright and undisguised strangulation, suppression, and extirpation.

Ireland had great natural capacities for becoming a wealthy country. The greater part of its soil was very fertile; it was admirably provided with natural harbours; it possessed some navigable rivers and abundant water-power; its people were naturally ingenious and industrious. In consequence, it gave birth, from time to time, to various commercial and industrial enterprizes, which, if they had been allowed to grow, would in time have made the country one of the richest and most prosperous on the face of the globe. But the oligarchical government of England—which, it must be admitted, never really represented the people of England—looked with a jealous eye on those enterprizes, and stamped them out one after another by express and positive legislation.

The most forcible statement of the manner in which the various industries in Ireland were extinguished in the times to which we are now referring, will be a detailed record of the successive Acts of Parliament and other means by which that result was accomplished. But before we enter upon that record, it may be well to set down some corroboration in general terms of what we have asserted so far. Such corroboration is to be found in abundance in the works of English writers, from Temple to Froude.

ENGLISH CORROBORATION.

Very significant, for example, is the language of Sir William Temple as to how Ireland should be governed. He wrote in 1673 :—

“ Regard must be had to those points wherein the trade of Ireland comes to interfere with that of England, in which case the Irish trade ought to be declined, so as to give way to that of England.”

This candid and outspoken declaration of policy strikes the key-note of all English philosophizing on the same subject in Sir William Temple's time; and so unquestionable and proper did his ideas seem to some of his countrymen a century later, that when Anderson, in his *History of Commerce*, written in 1763, has occasion to speak of the "fair play" allowed to the Irish people, or rather to the English and Danish colonists of the Eastern parts of Ireland, in the thirteenth century, he actually thinks himself bound to make an apology for the concession! He writes:—

"In those early days commerce was not so perfectly understood as to be made subservient to the political interests of princes and states. . . . The trade liberties allowed to Ireland then (viz., 1229) would in our days be deemed unsafe and dangerous."

From this it appears that more enlightened principles of government and legislation prevailed in England in the thirteenth century than in the seventeenth or eighteenth.

Another Englishman, writing a hundred years after Anderson, and as strongly prejudiced against Ireland as Anderson was, tells us in a broad way what was done in execution of the plan of not allowing Ireland to become a prosperous commercial nation. Mr. Froude, in his account of *The English in Ireland*, indulges in many misrepresentations to the injury of the Irish people, but there is at least one Irish subject on which he speaks the truth. When he has to discuss the treatment Irish industry received at the hands of English governments, his indignation is thoroughly aroused, because amongst those most severely affected by that treatment the Protestant and British colony in Ireland occupied a conspicuous place. His statement of the facts and his condemnation of the wrong-doers are as satisfactory as any Irishman could desire. Thus he writes of the era following the Cromwellian despotism:—

"Before the days of coal and steam, the unlimited water-power of Ireland gave her natural advantages in the race of manufactures, which, if she had received fair play, would have attracted thither thousands of skilled immigrants. The Presbyterians held their ground in Ulster with the help of the now rising linen trade. Had other trades been permitted to grow, and an industrial middle class established itself in the southern

provinces, they would have speedily wrung adequate toleration from the dominant church. This one true and real justice to Ireland, unhappily, was precisely what the reconstituted government of Ireland refused to allow her. By the parties now and for another century in the ascendant there, Ireland was regarded as a colony to be administered, not for her own benefit, but for the convenience of the mother country."

Again, writing of the Williamite times, he says :—

"This Ireland, with her harbours and rivers, her unnumbered sheep flocks, fattened on her limestone pastures, producing the finest fleeces in the world—this nest of Popery and sedition—this bottomless morass of expense and confusion—was to lift up its head and prosper, tempt away English capital and workmen, rob England of the secret of her monopoly in the world's markets of the broad cloth, frieze, and flannel trade. . . . No language could sufficiently express the emotions of the exasperated English capitalist. The Parliament was called upon to 'make the Irish remember that they were conquered.' They should not be allowed to build or keep at sea a single ship. They should not manufacture a thing except their linen ; and their commerce should be so tied and bound that they should interfere with England nowhere. To block them from the water altogether, even their fishery 'must be with men and boats from England.' Their legislature, of which they made so ill a use, must be ended, and they must be governed by the Parliament of England."

Mr. Froude proceeds to sustain this indictment of his own countrymen, by a rapid and characteristic summary of the successive assaults made by them on every Irish industry without exception, not excluding even the linen manufacture.

PART II.

THE FIRST ATTACK.

The first direct attack made on Irish industry took place in the reign of Charles II., and the first branch of Irish industry struck at was the cattle and provision trade. The land of Ireland was at that time chiefly in pasture, and Irish wealth was chiefly derived from the exportation of cattle to England. Irish meat, butter, and cheese were also landed in considerable quantities at two or three of the western English ports. Very soon the English landowners took alarm at the circumstance. They

complained that the Irish cattle trade tended to lower the price of English cattle, and consequently to lower their rents; and accordingly they loudly demanded that their Irish rivals, even though many of these latter were of their own race and faith, should be driven out of the market. Their demands were granted. By laws passed in 1665 and 1680—in legal phraseology by 18 Car. II. cap. 2, and 32 Car. II. cap. 2—the importation from Ireland into England of all cattle, sheep, and swine, of beef, pork, bacon, mutton, butter, and cheese, was *absolutely prohibited*. “In this manner,” says Mr. Lecky, “the chief source of Irish prosperity was annihilated at a single blow;” while Mr. Froude writes on the point as follows:—

“Ireland had established a large and lucrative cattle trade with Bristol, Milford, and Liverpool. It was supposed to lower the value of English farm produce, and was utterly prohibited. Neither cow nor bullock, sheep or pig, fat or lean, might be transported from Ireland to England. Salt beef and bacon, even butter and cheese, lay under the same interdict.”

IRISH SHIPS SWEPT FROM THE SEAS.

But it was only the Irish cattle trade with *England* that was thus destroyed; Ireland still could and did send her products to the colonies; and, accordingly, her colonial trade was next made the object of hostile legislation by the English Parliament. That body went to work by sweeping Irish ships from the seas. By the Navigation Act of 1660, Irish vessels possessed all the privileges granted to English ones, but by the Amended Navigation Act, passed in 1663—15 Car. II. cap. 7—those privileges were taken away from Ireland, by simply ordaining—first, that, with a very few specified exceptions, no European articles could be imported into the English colonies except from England, in ships built in England and manned by English sailors; and, secondly, that no articles could be brought from the colonies to Europe without being first unladen in English ports. Let Froude again bear corroborative testimony. “All produce of the colonies sent to Ireland,” says this writer, “and all Irish produce sent to the colonies, had first to be landed in England, and thence re-

shipped in English bottoms." In other words, the Irish, having been first forbidden to trade with England, were then forbidden to trade with the colonies, except through England. Of course those measures were successful for the purpose for which they were designed. "The conveniency of ports and harbours," wrote Swift, truthfully and forcibly, "which nature bestowed so liberally on this kingdom (Ireland), is of no more use to us than a beautiful prospect to a man shut up in a dungeon."

DESTRUCTION OF THE WOOLLEN MANUFACTURE.

Between the Restoration and the Revolution, the Protestant colonists in Ireland made more or less successful efforts to establish more than one sort of manufacturing industry. For instance, the Irish landowners, prevented from exporting their cattle to England, raised vast flocks of sheep, and began to manufacture the wool thereby obtained. But from the first their efforts were watched with jealous eyes, and the Irish woollen industry especially attracted at an early period the hostile attention of the so-called statesmen of England. In 1636 Strafford saw the germs of a clothing trade here, and he promised to discourage it. Again, in 1660 an Act was passed imposing duties equal to a prohibition on the importation of Irish woollen goods into England. But it was not until 1698 that the crowning iniquity was accomplished, of practically suppressing the entire woollen industry of Ireland at a blow. It was done at the instance of certain English manufacturers, whose views are well set forth in the addresses presented by the two Houses of the English Parliament to William III. The address from the Lords said:—

"That the growing manufacture of cloth in Ireland, both by the cheapness of all sorts of necessaries of life and goodness of materials for making all manner of cloth, doth invite your subjects of England, with their families and servants, to leave their habitations to settle there, to the increase of their woollen manufactures in Ireland, which make your loyal subjects in England very apprehensive, that the further growth of it may greatly prejudice the said manufacture here. Wherefore, we humbly beseech your most sacred majesty, that your majesty

would be pleased, in the most public and effectual way that may be, to declare to all your subjects of Ireland that the growth and increase of the woollen manufacture there hath long been, and will be ever looked upon, with great jealousy, by all your subjects of this kingdom, and if not timely remedied, may occasion very strict laws totally to prohibit and suppress the same."

Similar language was held by the Commons ; to all which *the King replied that he would do all that in him lay to discourage the woollen manufacture in Ireland.*

What was done to this end is easily told. The Irish Parliament was summoned in September, 1698, and asked to impose heavy additional duties on the export of Irish woollen goods. It was the creature of the English government, and indeed was unable, even if it were willing, to resist the behests of England ; therefore, it complied with the English demands. But this was not all. Irish woollens having been excluded by the Navigation Act from the whole colonial market, and from the English market by prohibitory duties, were, by an English Act passed in 1699, excluded from every other part of the world also ! Mr. Froude's summary of this piece of legislation is as follows :—

"The export of Irish fleeces to any country but England had been already prohibited ; but the restrictions on the sale of the raw material was a temptation to the Irish to work it up at home, and as long as they might export their blankets and their friezes, England's trade was in danger from their competition. The English manufacturers considered it politic and fair to say to them, 'You shall not weave your wool at home at all ; you shall not sell your woollen cloths either here or abroad ; we will put you under such disadvantages that it shall not be worth your while to supply your own necessities ; you shall buy our cloths and frieze to clothe your own backs ; you shall sell your fleeces only to us, and, as it is our interest to have it on easy terms, you shall take the prices we are pleased to offer.'"

On Ireland the effect of this legislation was crushing. The woollen manufacture was her chief industry. It promised to grow till it should enrich the country from end to end. It was shattered and uprooted, and in consequence, tens of thousands of hands were thrown out of employment ; twenty thousand of "the bravest defenders of English interests," as Froude sorrowfully

says, left Ulster alone for America, other Irish Protestants had to fly to England and the Continent ; and for fifty years afterwards the Irish who remained at home were in such a state of poverty, in consequence of having been *thrown for sustenance entirely upon the land*, that, as Mr. Lecky says, every bad season produced amongst them an absolute famine.

“ FOSTERING ” THE LINEN TRADE.

It is supposed by many Irishman that the suppression of the woollen manufacture of Ireland was accompanied by the fostering of the Irish linen manufacture. It is certainly true that when it was proposed to destroy the one industry, it was promised in compensation to encourage the other. This promise was made by King William in response to the request of the English Parliament. But was it kept? Even if it had been, no real reciprocity would have been established between the two countries, for the linen manufacture was a trifling business compared with the woollen trade. In 1700 the value of the Irish linen exported was only about £14,000. Moreover, that a nation should be restricted to certain forms of industry is an abominable principle. But the promise was broken. Although the Irish linen trade never materially interfered with the linen trade of England, and although it did, in fact, rather benefit England under the then existing circumstances, by giving business to the merchants engaged in the work of re-exportation, yet it too, as well as the woollen trade, was repeatedly made the object of hostile legislation. Hely Hutchinson writes, on 1st July, 1779, in a letter to the Earl of Buckinghamshire :—

“ It is true you promised, in return for the restraints, to encourage our linen manufacture. But how have you done it? By giving large bounties for the making of coarse linen in the Highlands of Scotland—bounties on the exportation of English linen—opening the linen manufacture to all persons without serving apprenticeships, and imposing a tax of 30 per cent. on all foreign linens, which has been construed to extend to Irish printed, stained, dyed, striped, or chequered.”

Mr. Lecky writes :—

“ The Irish woollen trade was ruined in 1699, but no legislative encouragement was given to the Irish linen manufacture till 1705, when, at the

urgent petition of the Irish Parliament, the Irish were allowed to export their white and brown linens, but these only to the British colonies, and they were not permitted to bring any colonial goods in return. The Irish linen manufacture was undoubtedly encouraged by bounties, but not until 1743, when the country had sunk into a condition of appalling wretchedness. In spite of the compact of 1698, the hempen manufacture was so discouraged that it positively ceased. Disabling duties were imposed on Irish sail-cloth imported into England. Irish checked, striped, and dyed linens were absolutely excluded from the colonies. They were virtually excluded from England by the imposition of a duty of 30 per cent., and Ireland was not allowed to participate in the bounties granted for the exportation of these descriptions of linen from Great Britain to foreign countries."

To all this we may add that, though, as Mr. Lecky says, bounties were granted in 1743 as well on the export of some Irish linens to foreign countries, as on that of English and Scotch linens, the benefit was very much less to Ireland than to England or Scotland, because the Irish could get those bounties only by exporting from an English port, and paying the expenses incidental thereto; that, by the 29 Geo. II. cap. 15, no Irish linen exported from England should be entitled to a bounty if it were the property of a resident in Ireland; and that while England restricted the entry of Irish linens into her own markets, she kept the Irish market open for British linen, by imposing low duties on linen imports into Ireland. In short, it is a complete delusion to suppose that the English government fostered the Irish linen trade when or because she had destroyed the Irish woollen manufactures, though, of course, she did not absolutely ruin it.

THE FUNDAMENTAL MAXIM.

Unless we bear constantly in mind the fundamental maxim which governed the English commercial legislation of the eighteenth century, we shall find it difficult to believe, even in face of the evidence furnished by the statutes of the realm, that the blows reported to have been aimed by England at Irish industries were ever really inflicted. It was assumed without question or hesitation that the commercial interests

of a dependency of the British Crown should be entirely subordinated to those of what was facetiously called the mother country ; and “to an English mind,” says Mr. Lecky, “there was no reason why this principle should not be rigidly applied to Ireland.” Davenant, who in the first half of the eighteenth century was the most influential writer on commercial questions in England, strenuously maintained that Ireland, possessing the advantage of greater cheapness of living and labour, was sure to become a dangerous rival in commerce to his own country ; and he therefore held, that every branch of business in Ireland which was likely to compete with the corresponding branch in England, should be destroyed or suppressed. He was willing that the English planted in Ireland should receive every encouragement that could “consist with the welfare of England,” and he recommended the admission of Irish cattle into England as “the best means of diverting the Irish from manufactures ;” but he supported the absolute prohibition of the Irish woollen manufacture, and the steady discouragement of the Irish linen trade. To offer effective resistance to the carrying out of this policy, the Irish Parliament was, as we have already said, utterly unable, even if it had been willing ; and outside the Parliament there was no class who possessed any greater powers of self-defence. Mr. Lecky, contrasting the state of Scotland and the American colonies with that of Ireland in this respect, says :—

“Scotland possessed an independent Parliament, supported by the entire nation, and she was, therefore, able to make herself so troublesome, that England purchased the Union by ample commercial privileges. The American colonies contained within themselves unlimited resources. No legislation could counteract their great natural advantages. They were inhabited by a people who, from the circumstances of the case, possessed much more than average energy, and they were so large and so distant from the mother country, that it was practically impossible very seriously to injure their trade. The position of Ireland was totally different. Her Parliament was totally dependent on that of England. Her ruling caste was planted in the midst of a hostile and subjugated population. She lay within a few hours of the English coast. The bulk of her people were crushed to the very dust by penal laws, and most of the men of energy and ambition were driven from her shore. She was thus com-

pletely in the grasp of England, and that grasp was tightened till almost every element of her prosperity was destroyed."

We have seen how the Irish cattle trade and the Irish woollen manufactures were extinguished, and how the Irish linen manufacture, in violation of a solemn engagement, was all but destroyed ; now we proceed to show how almost every other form of industry which Ireland possessed was also made the object of more or less successful attacks by the Parliament of England.

KILLING THE IRISH COTTON MANUFACTURE.

It is not generally known that cotton, as well as wool and flax, was once extensively manufactured in Ireland. That, however, is the case ; and it is also the case, that the Irish cotton industry, like the woollen and linen industries, was assailed by hostile legislation. In three successive reigns, Acts of Parliament were passed putting virtually prohibitory duties on Irish cotton manufactures imported into England. These Acts were 15 Car. II. c. 5 ; 3 & 4 Anne, c. 4 ; and 4 & 5 William and Mary, c. 5. As much as 25 per cent. duty was at last imposed on the Irish cotton fabrics ; and lest this enormous charge might not prove sufficient for its purpose, an Act was passed in the seventh year of the reign of George I. which enacted penalties on the wearing in Great Britain of any cotton manufactures made outside that country. Nor was this all ; for the Act entitled 11 Geo. II. c. 1, added such further restrictions on the Irish trade, that it was all but impossible for the Irish manufacturers to send their goods into England at all. But even this was not all ; for while Irish cottons were thus kept out of the English markets—and consequently, as Ireland was forbidden to trade with the colonies except through England, out of the other chief markets of the world also—British cottons went into Ireland in immense quantities at only 10 per cent. ! Of course the Irish cotton manufacture could not survive such legislation, and after a short time it perished.

ATTACKS ON IRISH BEER AND MALT.

We next come to the legislation dealing with the production of

Irish beer and malt. Here was another field of Irish industry which was being cultivated with considerable success, and the profits from which promised to be very large. Unfortunately, the promise was delusive, for this industry was also prematurely crushed. In the first place, while English beer and malt were sent into Ireland at almost a nominal duty, similar Irish articles were absolutely excluded from England! Depriving the Irish brewers of a market might well be thought a sufficiently strong measure; but the English Parliament went farther, and next sought virtually to prevent the Irish from making any beer at all, even for their own use! The 9 Anne, c. 12, actually prohibited them from importing hops, which are necessary to the manufacture of beer, from any other place but Great Britain. Importation of hops from other quarters was styled in this Act "a public and common nuisance." It is needless to explain the effect of such a prohibition. It was equivalent to laying an additional heavy duty on the Irish product, and thus rendering the profitable brewing of it absolutely impossible. It is true that by the 4 George II. c. 16, the prohibition against the direct importation of colonial goods into Ireland was somewhat relaxed—because, as it was expressly stated, of the "great prejudice to the trade and navigation of Great Britain" which the prohibitory policy had produced. But when it was discovered that amongst "colonial goods," the importation of which was permitted by the Act just quoted, were included hops, another Act was promptly passed to rectify what was regarded as a blunder! We refer to the 5 George II. c. 2, which declared that the trifling relaxation authorized by the enactment of the previous year, should not be construed to allow hops into Ireland from the colonies! Again, the 7 George II. c. 19, added to the restrictions which had up to that time been imposed on the importation of hops. If the beer and malt business survived, the wonder surely is how it did.

THE "PROTESTANT" INDUSTRIES.

The destruction of the woollen manufacture particularly affected, as we have seen, the Protestants of Ireland. That

industry gave employment to 12,000 Protestant families in Dublin, and to 30,000 dispersed over the rest of the kingdom—all of whom were ruined by the legislation of the time of the Protestant king, *par excellence*, William III. But the woollen manufacture was not the only branch of Irish trade in the prosperity of which Irish Protestants were more deeply concerned than any of the other inhabitants of Ireland in the eighteenth century. At the very time that William and his Parliament were engaged in driving out one class of manufacturers, they gave every encouragement to the immigration of another class—namely, the Huguenots, who fled from France on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and other foreign Protestants. These people brought with them an industry which they had almost made their own—the manufacture of fabrics, such as silk, suited to the needs of a luxurious civilization. On two grounds they ought, one would imagine, to have recommended themselves to the favour of the English government. First, they professed the creed which England chose to regard as orthodox; secondly, they pursued towards the people amongst whom they were introduced, the very policy of exclusion which the English Parliament had all along acted upon towards the same unfortunate race. They exerted themselves to prevent the Irish from learning their arts or profiting by their industry. On this point, Assistant-Commissioner Otway, in a document known as the Handloom Weavers' Report, and dated February, 1840, writes:—

“The fabrics introduced by the English and French settlers were of a superior quality, for which the native Irish could only gradually acquire a want, as they were raised in the scale of civilization. But instead of thus raising them, the foreign manufacturers, aided by the legislature, employed every possible means to depress them, and thus blindly drove from their market a whole nation of customers, and confined them to the use of the rude and cheap fabrics which were woven amongst themselves.”

Nevertheless, *England rewarded the Huguenots by assailing the specially Protestant industries with as little compunction as if they were Celtic and Catholic.* The Irish silk trade was attacked

by the 2 George II. c. 2; the manufacture of gold and silver lace by the 21 George II. c. 1; the velvet trade by the 23 George II. c. 2; the paper manufacture by the 33 George II. c. 1. The raid, in short, was of the most sweeping character; but it would seem to have been directed with particular thoroughness against the silk weavers. A writer in *The Repeal Dictionary* says:—

“ In addition to the discouragement affecting our silk manufacture, in common with our other manufactures, it had the further discouragement that, coming to us, as the raw material did, through England, the sum of three pence in the pound was retained there of the original import duty in that country, and the price thereby so much enhanced to us, in addition to the benefit, at our expense to the English revenue.”

In the same reign—that of George II.—restrictions were laid on the hat, glass, gunpowder, coals, bar-iron, and iron-ware trades. The glass business was, perhaps, the most important of the group, and by an Act passed in the 19th year of George II. Ireland was prevented from importing that article from any country but Great Britain, and could not export it at all. It is true that certain British Acts in the reign of George II. purported to modify some of the restrictions on Irish trade; but Hely Hutchinson in his *Commercial Restraints*, shows conclusively that those very Acts contained conditions that effectually neutralized the professed benefit.

When England became involved in war with America, the English government conceded in embarrassment what it had refused when it was not in trouble. By virtue of the 18 George III. c. 55, there was a considerable extension of the Irish exports to the British plantations. But here again the concession was greater in appearance than in reality. The Irish exports favoured by the Act just mentioned did not include any of the important ones, such as woollens, cottons, or linens, hats, glass, hops, gunpowder, or coals.

EMBARGOES.

Moreover, in the time of George III. adverse legislation was supplemented by a system of embargoes. Hutchinson, at the close of his enumeration of the restraints on Ireland, says:—

“A course of occasional and ruinous restrictions ought not to be passed over. Since 1740 there have been twenty-four embargoes in Ireland, one of which lasted three years.”

This was in 1779. In the previous year Mr. Edmond Perry, Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, transmitted to the government a memorial from several merchants, showing how their interests had been destroyed by embargoes. The merchants in question were then still suffering from an embargo dated the 25th of October, 1776; and the paper transmitted by the Speaker affirms that, “on the strictest inquiry, it was found that numbers of them are ruined in their circumstances by this severe embargo of so long a continuance.” It may, perhaps, be as well to explain that an embargo meant a stoppage of trade for a definite period, by order of the constituted authorities.

SUMMING UP.

Hutchinson, summing up the Irish commercial restraints in general, before 1782, says:—

“Ireland was by those laws excluded from almost all the trade of three-quarters of the globe, and from all direct beneficial intercourse with her fellow-subjects in those countries (the colonies), which were partly stocked from her own loins.”

PART III.

THE IRISH AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY.

Every branch of Irish trade and manufacture having been destroyed or crippled, the next step was to injure, if not destroy, the sole remaining industry of Ireland—that of agriculture.

We do not intend here to enter into an examination of the entire Irish land question as it existed in the eighteenth century; the accomplishment of such a task would itself require a small volume. We mean to deal only with a part of that question which became particularly urgent when the people who stayed in Ireland after the destruction of its manufactures were thrown for subsistence entirely upon the land. It is, perhaps, scarcely necessary to say that we refer to the action of the English legis-

lature, whereby the evil of an excessive amount of pasturage was maintained, till a series of desolating famines resulted, and vagrancy became for a time a feature of the national life.

The tendency to turn great tracts of land into pasture at the time to which we are now referring, is accounted for by Mr. Lecky in this fashion :—

“ At the time of the wool trade much of the land had taken the form of pasture. Besides this, pasture required little skill, and was therefore natural to a country where the people possessed scarcely the rudiments of agricultural knowledge. It required little capital, and was therefore well suited to a country which was extremely poor, in which a great portion of the people were forbidden by law to invest their money in land, and in which, owing to recent confiscations, property was still insecure. It simplified the conditions of property, and therefore had a peculiar attraction to a proprietor who imagined, with reason, that his tenants were his enemies, and who inherited all the multifarious disadvantages and dangers attached to the position of an Irish landlord.”

Add to all this the fact that the Irish House of Commons—which, be it remembered, was but the slave of England—passed in 1735 a resolution relieving pasture land from the burden of tithes, and that the agricultural industry of the greater part of the people was paralyzed by the penal laws, and it will be easily understood how landowners and leaseholders were alike tempted to stock meadow and mountain with sheep and black cattle. “ In 1727,” says Mr. Froude, “ the average size of the farms in the three southern provinces ranged from 800 to 1,000 acres.” Those farms were almost all in pasture. The tenants, indeed, were forbidden in their leases to break or plough the soil. Swift, in his pamphlet on *The Use of Irish Manufactures*, says “ that the landlords everywhere, by penal clauses, prohibited their tenants from ploughing ;” and this testimony is borne out by several contemporary writers, and by manuscripts of the time in Dublin Castle. The effect on the country would, doubtless, not have been very injurious had the woollen trade and the cattle trade been allowed to exist ; but as it was, ruin and misery of the most appalling character resulted. Viscount Taaffe, a Catholic nobleman, writing on this subject in 1766, says :—

“ This sort of self-defence, in keeping the lands uncultivated, had the further consequences of expelling that most useful body of the people, called yeomanry in England, and sculoags in Ireland—communities of industrious housekeepers, who in my own time herded together in large villages, and cultivated the lands everywhere, till, as leases expired, some rich grazier, negotiating privately with a sum of ready money, took their lands over their heads. . . . The sculoag race—that great nursery of labourers and manufacturers—has been dispersed in nearly every quarter; and we have nothing in lieu but those most miserable wretches on earth, the cottagers—naked slaves, who labour without food, and live, while they can, without houses or covering, under the lash of merciless and relentless taskmasters.”

Froude is more explicit and emphatic. He says:—

“ The people, no longer employed, were driven away into holes and corners, and eked out a miserable subsistence by potato gardens, or by keeping starving cattle of their own on the neglected bogs. Their numbers increased, for they married early, and they were no longer liable, as in the old times, to be killed off like dogs in forays. They grew up in compulsory idleness, encouraged once more in their inherited dislike of labour,* and inured to wretchedness and hunger; and on every failure of the potato crop hundreds of thousands were starving.”

In fact the cottier population was driven to the mountains and the bogs, where in winter they cultivated patches of land too small for their support, and whence in summer and autumn they strayed over the country in search of work. When the potatoes did not fail, the fare of those unfortunates barely sufficed to maintain life; when a bad season came, deaths by starvation occurred by the thousand. Swift at this period wrote, *apropos* of this matter: “ Ajax was mad when he mistook a flock of sheep for his enemies, but we shall never be sober till we have the same way of thinking.”

REMARKABLE ACTION OF THE IRISH PARLIAMENT.

But—and here is the point at which we have been aiming—the

* The slander involved in these words is characteristic of Froude, but it has been so often refuted that we need not pay any attention to it here. Probably no people on the face of the earth have been so industrious as the Irish in the face of so many circumstances tending to take away all incentives to labour.

Irish Parliament, defective though it was as an organ of the national will, would have prevented or mitigated the dreadful effects of the policy of the Irish landlords, were it not for the government and Parliament of England. It is surely a remarkable and suggestive fact, that a body of men who were aliens in blood, language, and religion to the suffering Irish, who represented the conquerors and confiscators of the Revolution, who were in most cases the nominees of English constituency-owners, and who would themselves have benefited as much as any set of persons by the maintenance of the land in pasture, were nevertheless led, by the circumstances of their residence in Ireland, and by seeing with their own eyes the nature and extent of the prevailing distress, to put a stop to its cause. The Irish House of Commons in 1716, unanimously resolved to make an effort to change the entire economical system of Ireland, and to reclaim both people and country by bringing back and stimulating agriculture. It passed a resolution, declaring that covenants which prohibited the breaking up of the soil were impolitic and should have no binding force; and not satisfied with taking that important step, it passed the heads of a bill, which it recommended with the utmost earnestness to the English Council,* providing, first, that for every hundred acres held by any tenant, five should be broken up and cultivated, and secondly, that bounties should be granted by the government on corn grown for exportation.

HOW THE IRISH PARLIAMENT WAS MET.

The proposal was modest and reasonable. How did the English government receive it? Let Mr. Froude—on this matter an unimpeachable witness—answer. The words of that writer are :—

“ The bounty system might or might not have been well calculated to produce the effect which Ireland desired. It was the system, however, which England herself practised with every industry which she wished to encourage; and it was not on economic grounds that the Privy

* No bill could be passed at this time by the Irish Parliament without having been first approved by the English Privy Council.

Council rejected a bill which they ought rather to have thrust of their own accord on Irish acceptance. The real motive was probably the same which had led to the suppression of the manufactures—the detestable opinion that, to govern Ireland conveniently, Ireland must be kept weak. Although the corn consumed in Ireland had been for many years imported, the English farmers were haunted with a terror of being undersold in their own and foreign markets by a country where labour was cheap. A motive so iniquitous could not be confessed, but the objections which the Council was not ashamed to confess were scarcely less disgraceful to them. The English manufacturers having secured, as they supposed, the monopoly of Irish wool on their own terms, conceived that the whole soil of Ireland ought to be devoted to growing it. The merchants of Tiverton and Bideford had recently memorialized the Crown on the diminution in the number of fleeces which reached them from the Irish ports. They attributed the falling off to the contraband trade between Ireland and France, which shortened their supplies, enhanced the price, and gave the French weavers an advantage over them. Their conjecture was perfectly just. The contraband trade, as had always been foreseen, had become enormous. But the Commissioners of the Irish Revenue were unwilling to confess to carelessness. They pretended that the Irish farmers, forgetting their obligations to England, and thinking wickedly only of their own interests, were diminishing their stock of sheep, breaking up the soil, and growing wheat and barley. The allegation, unhappily, was utterly untrue. *But the mere rumour of a rise of industry in Ireland created a panic in the commercial circles of England.* Stanhope, Walpole, Sunderland, and the other advisers of the English Crown, met the overtures of the Irish Parliament in a spirit of settled hostility, and with an infatuation which now appears like insanity, determined to keep closed the one remaining avenue by which Ireland could have recovered a gleam of prosperity."

NO CONCESSIONS.

Now, however, let us see what exactly was done in answer to the demand of the Irish Parliament for a measure for the encouragement of tillage.

In a letter of Lord Stanhope to the Lords Justices, dated 2nd March, 1716, that demand was refused, on the ground that any encouragement to the corn trade of Ireland might prejudice the corn trade of England! The Lords Justices, however, having returned the conclusive rejoinder, that Irish corn could not possibly be cheaper than English, as Ireland

had actually been importing large quantities of the latter for several years, the bill of the Irish Parliament was at last returned with the approval of the English Council. But not, be it observed, the bill in its original shape ; for a clause was slipped in, empowering the Council to suspend its provisions at its pleasure—that is, rendering the whole measure a mockery ! It is not surprising to learn that the Irish House refused to accept the mutilated proposal. It did not, however, thereupon lose heart. Three years afterwards it reintroduced its tillage bill. This time the English Council gave no answer at all ! Eight years afterwards, it is true, the English Council consented that the prohibitory clauses in the leases of the Irish landlords should be cancelled, but that was only after a great potato failure—when, in the words of Froude, the roads were covered with starving beggars, and in every cabin there was one or more persons dead or dying. Moreover, even the slight concession that was then made, was owing solely to the intercession of Archbishop Boulter, who persuaded the Duke of Newcastle that it was neither safe nor wise to condemn the Irish to recurring famine, and frightened him by drawing his attention to the stream of recruits who passed from Ireland into the armies of the Continent. Nay, more ; though the concession was granted in name, it was withheld in practice. “It was one thing,” as Mr. Lecky observes, “to pass a law ; it was quite another to carry it into execution, in a country where it was almost hopeless for a Catholic tenant to obtain legal redress against a Protestant landlord. No measures appear to have been taken to enforce the new Act, and the famine of 1741 and 1742 repeated in a very aggravated form the horrors of 1728.”

LAW-MADE HORRORS.

Those law-made horrors were simply awful.

Men, women, and children, Swift assures us, were “every day dying and rotting by cold and famine, and filth and vermin.” If labourers accidentally got work, they oftentimes had not the strength to perform it.

“The poor,” wrote Sheridan in 1728, “are sunk to the lowest degree of poverty and misery—their houses dunghills, their victuals the blood of their cattle or the herbs of the field.”

Nicholson, the Protestant Bishop of Derry, writing in 1700, tells how one of his carriage horses having been accidentally killed, it was at once surrounded by fifty or sixty famished cottagers, struggling desperately to obtain a morsel of flesh for themselves and their children !

One writer describes with terrible energy, as follows, the scenes which he witnessed around his own dwelling in Tipperary in 1741 :—

“ Multitudes have perished and are daily perishing under hedges and ditches—some by fevers, some by fluxes, and some through downright cruel want—in the utmost agonies of despair. I have seen the labourer endeavouring to work at his spade, but fainting for want of food, and forced to quit it. I have seen the aged father eating grass like a beast, and in the anguish of his soul wishing for his dissolution ; I have seen the helpless orphan exposed on the dunghill, and none to take him in for fear of infection ; and I have seen the hungry infant sucking at the breast of the already expired parent.”

We might adduce many more pieces of testimony like the foregoing, but it is needless to do so. It will be sufficient to add that a large proportion of the population of Ireland must have perished during those periodical famines. It is noted that in Kerry the collectors of hearth-money in 1733 returned the number of families paying the tax at 14,346, and that in 1744 it had sunk to 9,372—a third part having disappeared. In short, the operation of English law in Ireland in the eighteenth century was as destructive as the open barbarities of the Elizabethan age, and more destructive than that of Cromwell. Here, however, let not the mistake be made that it was only in the famine years that the vast mass of the people of Ireland were plunged into the direst misery. The truth is, their condition in those years was but a slight aggravation of their normal state. Deprived of every conceivable means of earning their bread, they were constantly in a state bordering on absolute starvation, and to keep body and soul together they were obliged to become

smugglers and vagrants, while many of them, under the same dire necessity, naturally turned thieves and robbers. And then the power which sought to starve them all to death, and did kill many of them by starvation ; which, by compelling almost all of them to live in idleness, converted many of them into thieves and vagrants ; which, in short, sought to educate into contempt and defiance of its own laws all the Irish whom it could not slay—this very power then began to pass Acts of Parliament to put down vagrancy and turbulence in Ireland ! And apologists and defenders of that power are found at this very day to denounce Irish lawlessness in the eighteenth century, and to sneer, like Froude, at the Irishman's "inherited dislike of labour."

PART IV.

MORE OF IT.

Mr. Lecky remarks, in the admirable work from which we have so often quoted, that while not one of the various depressing influences under which Irish industry laboured in the eighteenth century but could be paralleled in the annals of other countries, it would be difficult to find, in the whole compass of history, another instance in which such various and such powerful agencies concurred to degrade the character and blast the prosperity of a nation. We have seen how direct blows were aimed at every branch of Irish industry except the fisheries, which somehow escaped attack—although in 1698 two petitions were presented to the King from Folkestone and Aldborough, complaining of the injury done to the fishermen of those English towns, "by the Irish catching herrings at *Waterford and Wexford*, and sending them to the Straits, and thereby forestalling and ruining petitioners' markets," and although there was even a party in England who desired to prohibit all fisheries on the Irish coast, except by boats built and manned by Englishmen. But even if none of the blows to which we have referred had ever been delivered, there was still enough in the condition of things, arising out of the system of

government established in Ireland by England, to prevent Ireland, while that system was maintained in its integrity, from ever reaching that position of material prosperity, to which under other circumstances she might reasonably have aspired. When, indeed, we reflect on the confiscation of Irish land which disorganized the whole social condition of the country, the scandalous misapplication of the public revenues which at once demoralized and impoverished the nation, and the atrocious penal laws which condemned the immense majority of the people to both ignorance and poverty, the wonder is that any Irish industries ever grew to proportions sufficient to attract the envious regards of any other community whatever.

HOW IRISH CAPITAL WAS DRAINED AWAY.

One of the prime conditions of success in industrial pursuits—so we are often reminded now-a-days by English politicians—is the possession of capital. We shall now proceed to show how, in the age with which we have been dealing, a persistent effort was made in various ways to drain Ireland of every farthing of capital which she possessed.

The complete subservience of the Irish to the English Parliament before the era of 1782, is shown by nothing more than by the taxation imposed on Ireland at the beginning of the last century and by the manner in which the money obtained was spent. In 1715 the Irish debt was only about £16,000 ; in the succeeding fifteen years it grew to more than £330,000, to meet which, of course, a series of new duties came into existence. When it is recollect that the population was then only about two millions, and when the difference in the value of money is taken into account, it will be easily understood how severely such an impost must have pressed on Irish business. But the taxes were not only heavy in themselves, but they became more burdensome than they would ordinarily have been, by not being spent at home on useful objects. They were largely wasted on scandalous pensions. Mr. Froude is very explicit in treating of this matter. “In the latter half of the century,” he writes, “ Irish pensions were

used for parliamentary corruption. The unhappy country was then made to supply, out of its taxes, the material for its own demoralization"; and he goes on to mention, that whereas in 1723 the charge for pensions on the Irish establishment was no more than £30,000, "in 1733 it had risen in a total annual expenditure of half a million to £69,000." Practically the whole of this sum was sent to England; it was distributed amongst English persons of both sexes who could not be safely or largely provided for in that country. On this point Mr. Lecky gives the following details :—

"The Duke of St. Albans, the bastard son of Charles the Second, enjoyed an Irish pension of £800 a year; Catherine Sedley, the mistress of James the Second, had another of £5,000 a year. William bestowed confiscated lands exceeding an English county in extent on his Dutch favourites, Portland and Albemarle, and a considerable estate on his former mistress, Elizabeth Villiers. The Duchess of Kendal, and the Countess of Darlington, the two mistresses of George the First, had pensions of the united annual value of £5,000. Lady Walsingham, the daughter of the Duchess of Kendal, had an Irish pension of £1,500. Lady Howe, the daughter of Lady Darlington, had a pension of £500. Madame de Walmoden, one of the mistresses of George the Second, had an Irish pension of £3,000. The Queen Dowager of Prussia, sister of George the Second, Count Bernsdorff, who was a prominent German politician under George the First, and a number of other less noted German names, may be found on the Irish pension list."

In addition to the profligates mentioned in the foregoing list as having been quartered on the Irish pension establishment, Froude mentions Sophia Kilmansecke, another mistress of George the Second, who was created Countess of Leinster and endowed with £2,000 a year. Besides the pensions there were the salaries for English sinecurists, which were almost as scandalous. Mr. Lecky says on this subject :—

"Until Lord Townshend's administration, the Viceroys were always absent from the country from which they derived their official incomes, for more than half, usually for about four-fifths, of their term of office. Swift in one of his *Drapier's Letters*, written in 1724, has given a curious catalogue of the great Irish offices, some of them perfect sinecures, which were then distributed among English politicians. Lord Berkeley

held the great office of Master of the Rolls ; Lord Palmerston, that of First Remembrancer, at a salary of nearly £2,000 a year ; Dodington was Clerk of the Rolls, with a salary of £2,500 a year ; Southwell was Secretary of State ; Lord Burlington was hereditary High Treasurer ; Mr. Arden was Under-Treasurer, with an income of £9,000 a year ; Addison had a sinecure as Keeper of the Records in Birmingham Tower ; and four of the Commissioners of Revenue lived generally in England."

All the chief employes, in fact, in Church and State, were Englishmen, and lived in England most of their time, while they drew their means of subsistence from Ireland. Here, surely, was a serious drain upon the revenues of a country already miserably poor.

But there was another drain still more exhausting. We refer to that produced by the absenteeism of the Irish landlords. Hutchinson, in his book on the *Commercial Restraints*, which was published in 1779, stated that "the sums remitted from Ireland to Great Britain for rents, interest of money, pensions, salaries, and profit of offices, amounted, on the lowest computation, from 1668 to 1773, to £1,110,000 annually ;" and Arthur Young, who also wrote in 1779, estimated the rents alone of the absentees at about £723,000. The causes of this evil are, of course, to be found partly in the fact, that a very large part of the confiscated land was given to Englishmen who always considered their own country as their real home, partly in the fact that English speculators who were of the same way of thinking bought up a great part of the rest of the land, and partly in the feeling that Ireland was "no place for an Irish gentleman." But whatever the remoter causes of the absentee drain may be, the effects of that drain, and of the profligate expenditure of the Irish taxes, were unmistakable. The country was impoverished to the last degree. A notable proof of this fact is given by Mr. Lecky in the following passage :—

"A patent was granted to some French refugees in 1700, and Cromelin, a native of St. Quintin, laboured for many years with great skill and energy to spread the industry. He maintained that the soil and climate of Ireland were eminently adapted for the cultivation of flax, and that as good hemp could be grown over the country south of Dundalk as in any

part of the world. It was represented that it would be extremely desirable if Cromelin could be induced to settle in the centre of the island, and spread his industry among the half-starving population. He agreed to establish himself in Kilkenny. He obtained an extension of his patent, and an immediate payment of £2,500. *But this small sum was beyond the resources of the country; and a letter is extant in which the Lords Justices complain that Ireland was at this time too poor to raise it*, and recommended that, instead of money, the patent should be extended for a somewhat longer period."

Ireland in fact was sucked dry of capital, and of course, under such circumstances, it was impossible for the Irish people to maintain any native industry whatever on any considerable scale.

THE PENAL LAWS AND IRISH INDUSTRY.

We come now to speak of the effect of the penal laws on Irish industry; but on this point the world is much better informed than in reference to the other matters with which we have been so far dealing, and we shall therefore touch it but lightly.

It is obvious, as Mr. Lecky says, that all real enterprize and industry among the Irish Catholic tenants—that is, the great majority of the Irish people—were destroyed by the laws which consigned them to utter ignorance, and still more by the law which placed strict bounds to their progress, by providing that if their profits ever exceeded a third of their rent, the first Protestant who could prove the fact might take their farms. That the penal laws were practically a mere dead letter is, indeed, said by some unscrupulous writers; but it is a statement which is easily disposed of by glancing at the place which property cases under the penal code occupy in the proceedings of the Irish law courts. No less than one hundred such cases of a *typical* character were collected by a Protestant lawyer named Howard in 1769.

As to the galling injustice to which Catholic tradesmen, as distinct from Catholic agriculturists, were subject, a remarkable passage is quoted by Mr. Lecky, from a pamphlet entitled *The Case of the Roman Catholics of Ireland*, and written by a Dr. Nary in 1724. That passage is as follows:—

"At present there is not one freeman or master of any corporation, nor of any other of the least charge (bating that of a petty constable), of the Roman Catholic religion in all the kingdom ; neither are any of the tradesmen or shopkeepers of this religion suffered to work at their respective trades, or sell their goods in any of the cities in Ireland, except they pay exorbitant taxes, which they call quarterage, to the respective masters of their corporations ; and upon refusal of paying same (because there is no law for it) they are sure to be summoned to take the oath of abjuration, in order to frighten them into compliance."

"In the most Catholic parts of Ireland," writes Mr. Lecky himself, "many of the most lucrative trades were long a strict monopoly of the Protestants, who *refused to admit any Catholic as an apprentice.*" How, under such circumstances, there were Irish Catholic operatives, in any large number, possessing the requisite skill to work at any handicraft, is a mystery. In one of his speeches against Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule bill, Mr. Chamberlain expressed his sympathy with the small Protestant communities in various parts of Ireland, which he said had been centres of industry and civilization ; insinuating thereby, of course, that the Catholic populations by which they were surrounded were centres of something very different, and that it all came, of course, from a difference in the physical and moral nature of the two classes. Let us hope that, if he had known the truth, instead of taking such a line as this, he would have offered some apology for legislation that enriched most of his centres of industry and civilization, by plundering for their benefit the rest of the people, and then condemning the plundered majority, as far as it could, to perpetual poverty and misery.*

* It should be mentioned that many members of the Protestant communities, patronized by Mr. Chamberlain, repudiate his sympathy with scorn. Those men, like their ancestors for many generations, have indeed reached respectable and influential positions by steady industry and good business habits, and it is precisely such men as they who are least frightened by the Chamberlain bogey of religious persecution as a result of Home Rule. Thus, at a meeting of the Irish Protestant Home Rule Association, in Dublin, on the 15th November of this year, Mr. William Smith, of Athlone, a manufacturer, said "they would not think their Protestantism deserving the name, if it wanted the defence of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Randolph Churchill," (See *Freeman's Journal*, 16th November, 1886.)

PART V.

C O N C L U S I O N .

In many branches of industry the blow struck by the hostile legislation of the reigns of William III., Anne, George II., and George III., left behind it permanent results, for in matters requiring the exercise of skill, and the long and continuous training which the possession of technical skill implies, a violent break is necessarily more or less disastrous. The reasons why the industries of England have flourished are numerous ; but one reason assuredly is that the continuity of English industrial development has never been broken. As Mr. Lecky remarks, most forms of manufacturing industry in England date from the Plantagenets and the Tudors. During many centuries, the increase of capital and the formation of habits suited to manufacturing purposes have been uninterrupted in that country ; and a similar statement might truthfully be made concerning every other country which has reached a great height of material prosperity through the exercise of handicrafts. In this respect, of course, Ireland is no exception to the general rule.

The Irish Parliament indeed, under the constitution of 1782, did something—nay, did much—to repair the ravages of the preceding century. It would have done still more in that direction if it had been allowed to continue in existence, and if the country had not been deliberately goaded by the English government, as it was in the few years preceding the Union, into disturbance and rebellion. But no Parliament could, in the short space of eighteen years, have completely undone the work of eighty. Many of the industries destroyed before 1782 have never been revived, and, as Lord Dufferin, the present Governor-General of India, has said : “even the traditions of commercial enterprize have perished in Ireland through desuetude.” Lord Dufferin’s further remark, however—namely, that the absence of competing industries has caused the land troubles, by throwing

the people entirely on the land for support—is without foundation; for, since the Union of 1800, the only places in Ireland where industries have flourished have been precisely those in which the cultivators of the soil have had some security for their property, and have been safe in their holdings; and one of the indirect, but most powerful means by which, since that disastrous measure, the development of Irish commercial industry has been absolutely prevented, is to be found in the laws which enabled the landlords to exterminate three millions of the people of Ireland, and to pauperize a large portion of the remainder.

How the Union has ruined Irish industries almost as effectually as the hostile legislation which we have summarized is, however, a subject deserving of a separate exposition. Meanwhile, we submit that the foregoing statement regarding the disastrous operations of English rule in Ireland in the eighteenth century, must not only cause many sad reflections in the mind of every fair-minded Englishman of the present day, but will also account to a large extent for the existing state of Irish industry, and for the feelings with which the thought of it fills the average Irish mind on the subject of the English management of Irish affairs.

The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) **Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill.** By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) **The Orange Bogey.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) **The Chicago Convention.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (4) **The Irish Land Crisis.**
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (5) **The "Castle" System.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (6) **The Truth about '98.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (7) **Irish Industries and English Legislation.**
By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

The Elections of 1885. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

Coercion. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.

By CHARLES DAWSON, EX-M.P.

The Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.

By ALFRED WEBB.

Price One Penny each.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms, to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.



Other Tracts in preparation.

The Irish Question.

THE TREATMENT OF MINORITIES IN IRELAND.

A LECTURE DELIVERED BY CHARLES DAWSON, ESQ.

Ex-Lord Mayor of Dublin, and Ex-M.P. for Carlow.

LONDON :

THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1886

Price One Penny.

HOW THE IRISH PEOPLE TREAT MINORITIES.

THE following Lecture was delivered at the Rotunda, Dublin, in aid of the funds of the South Dock Ward National Registration Association, on the evening of Wednesday, 12th May, 1886, MR. ALFRED WEBB in the Chair.

MR. CHARLES DAWSON, who on rising was loudly cheered, said :—

When invited by the National Registration Club of the South Dock Ward, to say some words in connection with their society, I was somewhat at a loss for a subject. These are times when all should follow the wise example of our leaders, and be circumspect in their words and deeds. They are times when those who love their country in both kingdoms should bear in mind the words of Mr. Gladstone on the very threshold of this great controversy, that no man should make more difficult a settlement between the two countries by any unnecessary bitterness imported into the discussion. Now, I have always held it as an axiom in my political career, that under the circumstances of Ireland's struggle an absolute and unqualified conformity to the policy of the party was imperative. To that I still adhere—I am also fully impressed with the prudence of the Prime Minister's advice. However, I think that, without compromising the party with which I act, or disregarding Mr. Gladstone's admonition, I may address myself to the subject I have selected. It is one that involves defence and not attack. The calumnies uttered against the majority of the Irish people at the present moment are many ; most of them wound their

feelings, but all do not touch their honour. Their poverty and their comparatively low position in trade and manufactures have been urged against them.

ABSENCE OF WEALTH AND ENTERPRISE.

As regards these attacks I shall only say, in the first place, they are grossly exaggerated, and in the next, that it is a matter of surprise that in the ranks of wealth and trade the Catholic people hold such a respectable position as they do. For centuries all the avenues through which wealth could flow to individuals were closed to the Irish Catholic people. The possession of the land ; the vast revenues of the endowed Church of the minority ; the emoluments of the Bar and the Bench, but lately thrown open ; the immense incomes of the high Government appointments ; concentrated millions of money in the hands of the favoured few, and diverted the resources and wealth of the nation from the mass of the people. Shut out from all these advantages, their efforts to create wealth by trade and enterprise were crushed by hostile legislation in three provinces out of the four. With such facts before him, how could Mr. Chamberlain accuse the Irish people of poverty? He was not always of this frame of mind. When the Tories declared that men who lived in mud cabins should not have votes, it was Mr. Chamberlain who said "If they had votes they would not be now in mud cabins." It is strange to hear one who argued so clearly then, now reproaching the Irish people with poverty and want of enterprise, which, if they had national life, would have long since disappeared.

These topics, were they mine to-night, I might enlarge upon ; but I shall merely say in connection with them that under a new state of things two grievances affecting trade and manufacture would be much lessened. At present, when the Irish party asks in the House of Commons for more war ships to be built or repaired at Belfast or Cork, they are told we have not much claim ; England is a loser by our connection ; and though

we are no gainers, I believe it is true. But did both countries decide upon a fair contribution from Ireland to Imperial expenses—be it one-tenth, one-twelfth, or one-fifteenth—then we clearly would have our claim to a proportionate share of the outlay upon all the Imperial matters carried on in the two countries; this would be an enormous gain to many a languishing trade and industry in this country. In the next place, the following grievance could scarcely disturb the equanimity of our respected fellow-citizen, Mr. J. R. Wigham, of Edmundson and Co. When I was Lord Mayor, and a member of the Irish Lights Board, I had the pleasure of frequent visits from **Mr. Wigham**. The object of these visits was to claim “protection” for his most valuable inventions of lighthouse illuminants, to claim “protection” for the Irish minority at the Irish Lights Board, and the Irish inventor from the injustice of the majority at Trinity House, London. Mr. Wigham found it very hard, with the assistance of such violent politicians as Lord Meath—who fiercely but vainly resented this London interference in Irish affairs—Mr. Gray, myself, and others to get justice done to Irish manufacture; and I don’t know whether he has yet secured it for his house or for the employment of the Irish artisan. If Mr. Wigham had to apply to a Dublin Department of Irish Lights, the fate of his ingenious invention would not be so doubtful as it is. To the most casual observer in England and in Ireland, the reasons for the prostrate condition of Irish trade, especially of that portion in Catholic hands, many and conclusive reasons can be given, and we can afford to let their consideration pass for the present.

THE ACCUSATION OF INTOLERANCE

is one, however, which touches the Irish people’s honour; it is a question of meanness, of brute force. Is it true? It is so notoriously false, and so extremely miserable an issue to import into a great controversy, that one would be almost inclined

to pass it by with scorn ; but when we find such men as Mr. Chamberlain in express terms raising up this bugbear of Catholic intolerance, the allegation must be met. In his letter to a Welsh gentleman, Mr. Chamberlain has used these words :—“ I cannot understand how the Nonconformists of the Principality, who know what persecution is, can consent to hand over the Protestants of Ireland, bound hand and foot, to the Roman Catholic majority.” The only answer we can give to this statement as regards the future is to point to the past and to the present. At each period of Parliamentary and Municipal Reform, in 1832, 1841, 1850, and 1884, how did the Irish Catholic majority treat the Protestants handed over, “ bound hand and foot,” to their mercy ? I shall arrange my answer in the following order :—The selection of members of Parliament from 1832 to the present time ; the distribution of municipal honours ; and lastly, the nomination to offices of emolument in the gift of Catholic majorities from 1842 to the present day. In the general election of 1832, thirty-three overwhelmingly Catholic constituencies used their new-born power to return at the polls

FORTY-THREE PROTESTANT MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Some of these elections are most instructive at the present moment, when revenge and retaliation is predicted of the Irish people. In Dublin city Mr. Ruthven, a Protestant gentleman, was chosen as the colleague of O’Connell, and the son of Mr. Ruthven was elected, a Protestant gentleman, as the colleague of Mr. Richard More O’Ferrall, to represent Kildare. In Kerry county Mr. Mullins, a cousin to Lord Ventry, was returned with the son-in-law of O’Connell. In Kilkenny, a Protestant aristocrat, brother of the Earl of Kilkenny, the Hon. Pierce Butler, was chosen ; whilst in King’s County the Hon. William Parsons, eldest son of the Earl of Rosse, was elected. For the county of Limerick, two Protestant aristocrats were elected—the brother of Lord Clare, and the son

and heir of Lord Guillamore. From Catholic Limerick city went Mr. David (afterwards Sir David) Roche, a Protestant, to accompany the Catholic representative, Mr. William Roche. From Mayo went two Protestants, one an aristocrat, and cousin to the Marquis of Sligo. Meath sent Mr. Henry Grattan, whose Protestant brother represented the county of Wicklow. In the Queen's County the patriotic father of its present patriotic member was accompanied in the representation of that Catholic county by the Protestant Conservative gentleman, Sir Chas. Henry Coote. From Athlone went Mr. Talbot, the grandson of Lady Talbot de Malahide. Dungarvan sent the Hon. George Lamb, brother of Lord Melbourne, and connected with that Under Secretary Drummond, who has written his name in the remedial legislation of Ireland. Such were the numbers, such were the classes, creeds, and politics of the members which Catholic Ireland selected from the "minority, handed over, bound hand and foot," to her mercy.

In pursuing this question of Parliamentary representation I must be clear on one point. I don't think

"TOLERATION"

requires that to represent a pure political opinion political opponents should be sent. As well ask the supporters of Lord Salisbury to vote for Radicals, or those of Mr. Gladstone to vote for Tories, as to ask the Irish people to send to represent their political views men who would vote directly against them. Many of the instances I have quoted show that at the election of 1832, in their excessive generosity, the Irish people of the three Catholic provinces forgot this sound political axiom. With a man's religion, as a candidate for Parliament, we have nothing to do, but with his politics a great deal—the one affects himself, the other affects us, our liberties, and our lives. This overweening fairness of the Irish people made them slow to learn this lesson and discrimination, and to its very recent

appreciation is due the fact, that we have not at this moment, as we heartily desire to have, more non-Catholic representative men. In the election of 1848, after the cruel pangs of famine, Catholic constituencies again sent over 40 non-Catholic representatives to Parliament. Amongst them we find, as in the list of 1832, Protestants like Sir Lucius O'Brien and Major M'Namara, for Clare; aristocrats like the Marquis of Kildare, for Kildare county; and Conservatives like Edward Grogan, for Dublin city.

At the bye-elections from 1848 to 1868, there were many instances of toleration in the matter of religion and politics, one of the most remarkable occurring in Limerick. Mr. Ball, a Catholic, was rejected, and Mr. James Spaight, an eminent Protestant merchant, was elected by the Catholic people. The moment he coincided with the people on public questions his difference of religion was forgotten. He has often been defeated since, not because of his religion, but because of his strong Conservative views, and his pronounced and unqualified opposition to the political aspirations of the people. At the general election of 1868, 33 Protestant members were elected by Catholic majorities, amongst them being again representatives of the upper classes—such as Lord Bourke, for Mayo; Lord St. Lawrence, for Galway; and Lord Otho Fitzgerald, for Kildare; and, persevering still in a mistaken liberality, even such pronounced Conservatives as Colonel Vandeleur, for the predominantly Catholic county of Clare. Who then asked the religion of Chichester Fortescue in Louth? or of Charles White in Tipperary? or of Mr. Whitworth in Drogheda? or of Jonathan Pim in Dublin? once their political opinions were in harmony with the people's, then as before, and now as then, the Irish Catholic people asked their representatives no questions as to their religion or their class and even in this very election there are instances where for a representative position they did not even ask their politics.

Coming down to 1874, when the political question of Home

Rule began to develop, the number of non-Catholics decreased ; but every Protestant who adopted the national demand was received with open arms, and 28 non-Catholic members represented Catholic constituencies in the Parliament of 1874. That non-Catholic representation unfolds most interesting incidents ; almost all the work and all the glory for Ireland was achieved by the Protestant representatives, to whom the Catholic people had confidently trusted their political liberties. Who were these men ? First, there stands out as the great beginning of this now closing contest, the representative of my native city—the Protestant father of Home Rule—Isaac Butt. William Shaw, the Presbyterian, was elected by the county of Cork, and succeeded to the confidence and leadership of the Irish Catholic people. Joseph G. Biggar, then a Protestant, is chosen to be one of that party, of which he has been one of the most useful and the most beloved members. John Martin, the Protestant Presbyterian of the North, was re-elected for the county of Meath ; and, crowning glory and crowning reward of Catholic confidence in Protestant faith, was the election by the Catholic people of Meath as his successor, of our Protestant leader,

CHARLES STEWART PARNELL.

Even under Mr. Parnell's defined and unmistakable political banner of 1880 and 1884, have not non-Catholics been returned everywhere they presented themselves ? And the only reason we have not many more Protestant representatives is to be found in the fact, that Protestants adopting the political views of the people did not come forward. Whenever they did, the statistics I have quoted prove that being a minority in religion has been a password, instead of an obstruction, to the favour and confidence of their Catholic fellow-countrymen. Let us now turn to the distribution of

MUNICIPAL HONOURS.

In 1841, the Catholic Corporations became possessed of politi-

cal power. Let me give a few instances of how they have used it in the way of offices of honour. In the city of Galway, at this moment, the chairman of the Town Commissioners, the chairman of the Harbour Board, and the Poor-law Guardians of the district are all Protestants ; in the city of

WATERFORD,

soon after the Municipal Reform Act of 1845, Sir Benjamin Morris, a Protestant, was elected Mayor, and again in 1846, 1850, 1852, 1854, 1859, 1862, 1867, 1873, 1879, and in 1884 and 1885, Protestant Mayors were elected in this Catholic city. In

LIMERICK,

at the first election after the Reform Act of 1841, thirteen Protestant members, some of them from the old Corporation, were elected to the new Council. Since that period thirteen non-Catholic Mayors have been elected, including a previous Mayor of the old Corporation, Mr. Jas. Spaight, the Protestant Conservative before alluded to, who was twice elected, and Sir Peter Tait, a Scotch non-Catholic, three times elected, and brother-in-law of the present Protestant representative of the county of Limerick. Since the Corporation has had the power to elect sheriffs, for four years the office has been filled by Protestant gentlemen. But it is in

CATHOLIC CORK,

and, as it has been called “rebel Cork,” that toleration and generosity seem to have been unbounded. At the first Reform election, nine Protestant gentlemen were named members of Council. The second Mayor of the new Corporation was a Protestant, Mr. Beamish ; and then in quick succession followed the Protestant Mayors, Mr. Dowden, Sir John Gordon, Sir John Arnott (now proprietor of the *Irish Times*), chosen three times Mayor of Catholic Cork. In 1878 Mr. Gregg, a Conservative, was made Mayor, and through this

office walked to the lucrative post of Crown Solicitor for the county. How soon the source of these titles and wealth, the Catholic confidence and toleration, is forgotten ! As with the office of Mayor, so with that of Sheriff. In the very second year the Council named Alderman Hall, a Protestant and Conservative ; and when through inferior health he could not serve, they named his son, Mr. Robert Hall : and ever since the Sheriffs' list has borne the names of non-Catholic and even Conservative gentlemen. The corporate representation on the Harbour Board up to last year contained eight Protestant gentlemen. From the Catholic capital of the South we come to

DUBLIN,

the Catholic capital of the nation. On its assumption of power, what did the Catholic Corporation do with the Protestant minority ? Did it bind them "hand and foot," as Mr. Chamberlain says, in the bonds of persecution ? It persecuted them after this fashion. At the first election many non-Catholics were elected as members of Council. The immediate successor of O'Connell as Lord Mayor was the Protestant, George Roe ; then there followed Mr. Arabin in the same office, and another was named Mr. Busby, but he could not act. After the Reform of 1849 the Council showed its liberality by electing Mr. B. Lee Guinness, afterwards made a baronet ; and following in almost uninterrupted alternation came the following Protestant Chief Magistrates of Dublin, elected almost unanimously by the Catholic majority :—Mr. Kinahan, Mr. Boyse, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Atkinson again, Hon. Mr. Vereker, Sir John Barrington, Mr. Wm. Lane Joynt (now Crown and Treasury Solicitor, and formerly Protestant Mayor of the Catholic city of Limerick), Mr. Purdon, Mr. Durdin, Mr. Brooks, Sir George Owens, Sir J. Barrington, down to my own immediate predecessor in 1881, Alderman Moyers, a Protestant and Conservative gentleman. During the brief time we have had the nomination of sheriffs,

many Protestant gentlemen have been placed upon the list ; and the Hon. Mr. Vereker, ex-Lord Mayor, filled the office in 1878, and Sir George Owens, a Protestant and Conservative, in 1881, at the very same time that Alderman Moyers, a Protestant and Conservative, was Lord Mayor. What a record of intolerance ! I present it to Mr. Chamberlain for the further instruction of the Welsh people. But I fancy I hear someone saying, “That is all very well ; honours are cheap. But what did you do with the

‘OFFICES OF EMOLUMENT ?’”

Well, here is what we did do with them in the towns I have named. In Galway, the present Borough Engineer is a Protestant ; in Waterford, the City Grand Jury Tax Collector, the Poor-rate Collector, the Solicitors to the Poor-law Boards, are all non-Catholic ; in Limerick, the Clerk of the Union is a Protestant Conservative gentleman of the highest position ; in Cork, up to a recent period, the present Town Clerk was the only Catholic who held, under the Catholic Corporation, a first-class office ; all the rest were Protestants. When, in 1854, the powers of the Grand Jury and Wide Street Commissioners were transferred to the Corporation, how did the Corporation of Cork treat the old officers ? And to this point I not only crave the attention of Mr. Chamberlain, but also that of the Civil Servants of this country, who are threatened with injustice, not by the advocates of, but by the opponents of Home Rule. The Corporation of Cork not only retained the officers whom they could have dismissed on small pensions, but they retained the Secretary of the Grand Jury, who had £111 a year, and they gave him £220, and the Secretary to the Wide Street Commission, who had a salary of £40, was promoted to a position of £100 a year. Even officers who had no legal claim were retained. In addition, a new office was created—that of City Engineer. Two persons competed, the Catholic and Nationalist, Joseph P. Ronayne, afterwards member for the city, and

Mr. Benson, Surveyor under the Grand Jury, a Protestant and Conservative. In consideration of his previous claim, the Catholic Corporation selected this Protestant and Conservative instead of the Catholic and Nationalist. Mr. Benson, afterwards knighted, got £600, instead of £150, his previous salary. The City Treasurership being vacant, a Protestant was elected, and, until recently, all the municipal chief offices in Cork, except that of Town Clerk, were held by non-Catholics, and they received £1,840 out of the £2,440 voted by the Catholic Council. In the matter of liberality as to paid offices,

DUBLIN ALMOST SURPASSED CORK,

and stands at this moment unrivalled in its wondrous toleration. The principal paid officers in the old Corporation were in connection with the Water Department. Of these the Corporation took over and retained till his death the Secretary, Sir Drury Jones Dickenson. Mr. Crofton was also retained, a Protestant gentleman. His son was in the corporate service, and his grandson, Mr. Mervyn P. Crofton, a Protestant gentleman, is in their service at this hour. Mr. Curtin, a Protestant gentleman, was Treasurer, and his successor, who now holds this high office, is Mr. Fry, a Protestant gentleman. The Chief Engineer, Mr. Neville, is a Protestant ; his assistant, Mr. Harty, is a Protestant ; Mr. Andrews, the Engineer of the Waterworks, is a Protestant ; Sir Charles Cameron, the Chief Officer of Health, is a Protestant ; and his predecessor, Mr. Boyle, was a Protestant ; and Mr. Young, late Chief of the Sanitary Department, is the son of a Presbyterian clergyman, and was supported by Mr. Gray, Alderman Meagher, Alderman Mulligan, and myself for that very office. In fact, out of the total sum of £8,400 per annum paid to chief officers in Dublin,

FOUR THOUSAND POUNDS

are paid at the present moment by the Catholic Corporation to non-Catholic gentlemen, and their religion or their politics

have never been inquired into. As to the religion of the lower-class clerks, I myself, though many years a member of the Council, and twice Lord Mayor, knew nothing whatever, nor did the heads of departments ; but I have since ascertained that of all the officials of all classes, twenty-two, or more than one-third, are non-Catholic. Now, can Mr. Chamberlain, in the annals of any English, Scotch, or Welsh town show me fact for fact with this splendid record of Irish Catholic toleration ? Can he produce a parallel from the annals of the caucus for this boundless, prodigal generosity to religious and political opponents ? But perhaps he can point it out to me in his

“SO-CALLED PROTESTANT ULSTER.”

I fear not. The toleration is as absent a feature in a great part of Ulster as the Protestantism. What are the facts on these two points ? The extremely Protestant division comprises one-fourth of the area, about two-fifths of the population, and three out of the nine counties ; the overwhelmingly Catholic division comprises three-fifths of the population, three-fourths of the area, and six of the counties ; and yet in his letter to Mr. Bolton, stirring up the North to armed resistance, Mr. Chamberlain uses the phrase “Protestant Ulster.” But how are the minority of Catholics treated in that portion where non-Catholics predominate in power and population ? There are more Catholics in proportion in

BELFAST

than there are Protestants in Dublin. Have they had, or have they now, in Belfast a Catholic member of their Council ? Have they now, or have they ever had, a Catholic Mayor, or a Catholic Sheriff, or a Catholic Treasurer, Engineer, or Officer of Health ? Have they now, or have they ever had, any Catholic officer whatever, paid or honorary, first-class or lower ? And if not, how can Mr. Chamberlain waste his solicitude upon them, except, indeed, it be a solicitude to protect their intolerance to the

Catholic minority, “bound hand and foot,” handed over to their mercy? Coming from the overwhelmingly Protestant Belfast, in point of numbers and power, how does

DERRY

act, where, though the Catholics are in the majority, the power is in non-Catholic hands? Though there are 17,000 Catholics to 12,000 non-Catholics, there is only one Catholic in the Corporation of Derry. This Corporation does not employ one solitary Catholic in any department. In the workhouse, although 80 per cent. of the inmates are Catholic, not a doctor, not an officer, not a nurse is a Catholic. In the whole of Armagh and Down no place of honour or emolument is given to a Catholic. This is true of railways, banks, factories, poor-law boards, etc. Coming to the Catholic districts of Donegal, Fermanagh, Tyrone, and Monaghan, there is not now, nor to my knowledge has there ever been, one single Catholic appointed to an elective position by the non-Catholic minority who still have power over the Catholic people. Surely somebody must have been deceiving Mr. Chamberlain; and because there is still a persecuted party “bound hand and foot” by intolerant power, they have convinced him, a stranger to Ireland, her topography, her history, and her present statistics, that this intolerant party is the Catholic party of five-sixths of Ireland, and not that small but powerful party whose stronghold is in the far north-east of Ulster, but whose out-works, kept up by foreign legislation, are to be found in every part of Ireland. The toleration of the Catholics in the south, and west, and east of Ireland has not induced this party, even in their midst, to follow their example. How many Catholics are to be found even out of Ulster in the offices of emolument in the gift of

“GRAND JURIES, PUBLIC BOARDS, AND COMPANIES”

ruled by non-Catholic majorities? I could make this inquiry,

I could show figures illustrating my point in every part of Ireland, aye, and in Dublin too, but I forbear in the spirit of avoiding unnecessary bitterness ; yet it is a matter of inquiry which unnecessary bitterness on the other side may yet make it imperative to disclose. Neither am I inclined to say a word to disturb the friendly feeling which is growing up between the two peoples, under the magic influence of Mr. Gladstone's noble policy.

But if Mr. Chamberlain will throw the stone of “persecution” and exclusion of the “minority” at the Irish people, what has he to say of his own country ? It has had all the opportunities, and more, than Catholic Ireland has had, of being tolerant to minorities. How did his country exercise it ? How many Catholic members of Parliament did the English constituencies elect ? How many Catholic mayors or sheriffs did English Corporations appoint ? How many well paid officers ? When I was in Parliament, during five years, out of over five hundred members from England and Scotland, there was but one Catholic.

Therefore, I think we are warranted in the conclusion that, as compared with our non-Catholic fellow-countrymen—as compared with the English and Scotch people—as compared with any people or country in the world—Ireland,

CATHOLIC IRELAND,

stands unsurpassed and unequalled in her boundless toleration and fair treatment of minorities. If Mr. Chamberlain makes predictions of a gloomy future from his incorrect data, may we not sketch a more happy time from the accurate annals of the past ? May we not hope with great confidence that a people who, after long persecution, used every accession of power—slowly and grudgingly given—to heap honours and wealth on their non-Catholic fellow-countrymen—may we not hope, I say, that in the plenitude of restored national power, they will exhibit in an increased degree the beneficent tolera-

tion they have hitherto shown ; thereby allaying all the fears of their timid fellow-countrymen ; thereby belying all the gloomy prophecies of their enemies, and thereby realising all the hopes of that great man who is now about to trust them ; that man who by degrees, in the face of immense difficulties, has built up the Irish liberties to the present climax, and whom we all hope may live to lay the foundation of a lasting peace between two friendly—because legislatively independent—nations, on the banners of which shall be indelibly inscribed the name of William Ewart Gladstone.



Since the above lecture was delivered the following additional instances of the toleration of Catholic majorities have reached me :—

In Dungarvan, where the “minority” consists of 120 non-Catholics amongst 7,400 Catholics, three out of four of the dispensary districts were presided over by Protestant chairmen elected by the Catholic majority. At the last election for Chairman of the Board of Dungarvan Union the one Protestant member out of twenty was elected for that post.

The Mallow Board, where the majority is Catholic, recently elected a Protestant physician for the workhouse, and a Protestant nurse for the hospital. Contrast this with Derry. The following instance shows that political claims being equal, the Catholic majority go out of their way to “protect” and favour the religious “minority.” At the recent election for one of the divisions of the Longford Union there were two candidates—both Nationalists, one a Protestant and the other a Catholic. The Protestant (Mr. James Campbell) was elected.

Two members of the Board of Town Commissioners of Kilmainham, near Dublin, having recently died, both being Catholics and Nationalists, and whose constituents are mainly

Catholic and National, the Inchicore Catholic Club met to select candidates to succeed them. At the suggestion of the Very Rev. Father Nicholl, O.M.I., the Club agreed to nominate only one candidate, in order to allow the "Protestant minority" to have one of the seats without a contest. It is a curious fact that in 1842, after the Municipal Reform Act, O'Connell proposed a similar policy. He offered one-third of the Municipal seats in Dublin to the "Protestant minority" without a contest. The offer was refused, and at the elections the party did not fare so well as if they had accepted the offer of O'Connell.



The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) **Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill.** By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) **The Orange Bogey.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) **The Chicago Convention.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (4) **The Irish Land Crisis.**
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (5) **The "Castle" System.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (6) **The Truth about '98.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (7) **Irish Industries and English Legislation.**
By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (8) **The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.**
By CHARLES DAWSON, EX-M.P.

Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P

The Elections of 1885. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

Coercion. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

The Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.
By ALFRED WEBB.

Price One Penny each.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.



Other Tracts in preparation.

NO. 9.

The Irish Question.

AN IRISH JUDGE ON THE IRISH QUESTION:

*Reprint of Mr. Baron Fletcher's Charge to the Co. Wexford
Grand Jury in 1814,*

With Introduction

BY

JOHN J. CLANCY, M.A.
M.P. for North Dublin.

LONDON:
THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1886

Price One Penny.

R. D. Webb and Son, Printers, Abbey-street, Dublin.

AN IRISH JUDGE ON THE IRISH QUESTION.

INTRODUCTION.

THE charge of Mr. Baron Fletcher, which will be found in the following pages, was delivered to the Grand Jury of the County of Wexford in the year 1814. Coming from such a man, who, it is needless to say, was neither a Catholic nor a Nationalist, the deliverance will be found to be one of the most remarkable exposures on record of the infamous oppression to which the mass of the people of Ireland have been subjected, under the Union, by “the propertied class” and the partizans of “law and order.”

It is not often that members of the Irish judicial bench have ventured on such disquisitions ; and, on the whole, it is somewhat wonderful that even Judge Fletcher, considering the time in which he lived, allowed his better feelings so to master his discretion. He ran real risk in the act, despite the so-called independence of the bench. A few years before, two other Irish Judges had had a sad experience of the results of administering the law of the land with some degree of impartiality. Within the first ten years of the Union, Mr. Justice Fox went the north-west circuit in the ordinary discharge of his duties as judge of assize. It was not long after the Emmett insurrection, and he had the temerity to insult the Orange Grand Juries who had been sworn before him, by telling them that all parties ought to forget and abandon their religious animosities by which the country had been distracted. He went further. He found some Catholic peasants in prison without any charge specified against them—one of them being kept in solitary confinement by order of the Earl of Ennis-

killen ; and at the same time he found that an Orangeman who was charged with a capital offence had been released without bail by two other Orangemen in the Commission of the Peace. In consequence, he dared to summon Lord Enniskillen before him, and when that personage did not deign to answer his summons, he fined him in the sum of £200, and fined three or four other magistrates smaller sums for similar offences. About the same time, Mr. Justice Johnson, in Donegal, was called on to fiat a presentment for a very considerable sum, to be levied, of course, entirely on the occupiers of land—as all Grand Jury charges are, and have been levied—in repayment, so it was pretended, of money advanced by the government for three hundred and fifty men, whom it was the duty of Lord Abercorn, in consideration of such money, to have recruited. The judge found that not a single man had been enlisted—in other words, that a gross fraud had been committed, and he accordingly refused to issue his fiat, and passed a strong censure upon Lord Abercorn. What was the result ? In the next ensuing session of Parliament, the Orange peer Abercorn got a special Act passed for the trial of Mr. Justice Fox by the House of Lords, for various high crimes and misdemeanours, including the infliction of unjust and excessive fines, and an attempt to bring Lords Abercorn and Enniskillen into contempt ! After an investigation, which lasted, with intervals, for three years, and in the course of which neither cross-examination nor defence was permitted, the proceedings were, indeed, quashed without any decision having been arrived at ; but the unfortunate judge was broken in health and fortune, and never recovered. The ruin of Johnson was not less complete, but it was accomplished in a more roundabout fashion. It was deemed too great a stretch of infamy to try him for his action as a judge ; but some anonymous letters published in Cobbett's *Register*, in reference to certain public acts of Lords Redesdale and Hardwicke, were esteemed libellous by those worthies, and Judge Johnson having been suspected of being the author of them, an *ex post facto* law was passed, under which he

was brought over to London, tried there for libel, and convicted. Judgment was not applied for ; but he was disgraced as a judge, although he afterwards got a pension. With events such as those fresh in his memory, it is, we repeat, somewhat wonderful that Baron Fletcher, in 1814, had the courage to go farther than Fox and Johnson, and scourge the landlords and the magistrates of the country, after the fashion of the famous Wexford charge. Partizanship, corruption, and even crime were enthroned in the high places of the land ; and no man, whether on the bench or off it, attacked them, except at the peril of his liberty and his fortune.

The charge of Baron Fletcher gives us a vivid glimpse into a past which is not very remote ; and what a state of things that glimpse discloses ! On the one side, the mass of the Irish people, peaceable and law-abiding, till goaded into crime by oppression and outrage ; labouring more industriously than slaves, but stripped to the skin by relentless rack-renters, the tax-gatherers of a hostile gentry, and the tithe-collectors of a church which was not theirs ; the victims not only of the most infamous robbery and oppression, but also of venomous falsehood and misrepresentation which sought to blast their reputation after they had been robbed of almost everything else. On the other side, a horde of plundering and heartless landlords, many of them permanent absentees ; Grand Jurors who habitually used their positions as such for purposes of the grossest jobbery and self-aggrandizement ; magistrates who habitually foreswore themselves ; Orange societies organising open murder and “ poisoning the very fountains of justice ” ; and the government in league with the landlords, the grand jurors, the magistrates, and the Orangemen, and executing their wishes.

Judge Fletcher shows how the landlords squeezed from the very vitals of the tenantry “ more than the actual value of the produce of the land ; ” how, to keep a foothold in the land, the peasantry were forced to offer rents which the land did not yield ; how many of them were housed worse than “ English sows ; ” how

the landlords contrived to get the occupiers of the land not only to pay monstrous rackrents, but to furnish, in the shape of Grand Jury cess, the means of building roads to their mansions and walls round their demesnes, *presentments for such infamous jobs as these, to the amount of over £9,000, having been discovered by himself at one assizes in Tipperary and quashed*; how, after all this, as if owing a return for some benefit conferred upon them, such of the wretched people as possessed votes were, at parliamentary elections, driven to the poll and kept “huddled like sheep in a pen” till they had voted as the landlords dictated. He shows how law was prostituted to the vilest ends—how innocent men were committed to prison by fraud, and were only restored to their “ruined and beggared families” when they were “lost in health and morals;” how on his political creed depended the fate of a prisoner in the dock, and how the credibility of a witness was measured by his party badge, when the jury box was filled with Orangemen; how beneficial leases were broken (and increases of rent thus secured) by means of the coercion act, which enabled a few magistrates to banish peasants “in a summary way;” how, in short, the mass of the Irish people were systematically taught to believe that the law was their mortal enemy, and should be defeated one way or another, if they were to have even the bare right of breathing the air of heaven. He notices also, how, nevertheless, the country was maligned by a hostile press, as if it were mainly inhabited by a race of irreclaimable savages; and how English visitors who had come to investigate the state of Ireland, were deliberately taken in hands by the very authors of all the villainy, and had their minds so filled with the most malicious and poisonous misrepresentations that they went back to England more convinced than ever that Ireland was a hopeless den of barbarism. Nor does this judge fail to expose and castigate the spurious “loyalty” under the mask of which the dominant faction invoked, and invoked successfully, the aid of the government in carrying on their war of plunder and oppression. Finally, the extremely remarkable passages in which, while energetically

condemning crime, he points out that Ribbonism was the product of oppression; that it was not surprising under all the circumstances of the case, however reprehensible it was, that the wretched peasant "rushed upon the perpetration of crimes followed by the rope and the gibbet;" and that there ought to be some other remedy for the evils of the country than coercion—those passages would appear strong, and would no doubt be accounted an incitement to crime, if spoken on a platform of the National League, but must appear still stronger and more suggestive when uttered by one who was himself an administrator of the law and "steeped to the lips" in loyalty.

But Mr. Baron Fletcher's charge is not only a vivid and truthful picture of a not remote past, but also to a large extent a guide to the actual and living present. Many of the very evils and infamies he courageously exposed and denounced still exist. Rackrents are still "wrung from the vitals of the Irish peasantry." Crime is still created by the operation of unjust laws. A small faction, growing smaller every day, still rules in the towns and counties of Ireland, and, except where and when it is kept in check by force of public opinion and the fear of public exposure in the press and in Parliament, and often even in face of those restraining agencies, perpetrates its jobs as of old, and prostitutes the power conferred on it by English law to party ends. Orangeism still poisons in many places the very fountains of justice. Professors of a spurious loyalty—a loyalty which, avowedly, is quite conditional and qualified, and which is simply loyalty to certain exclusive, unjust, and immoral powers and privileges—still swagger and strut about, and carry their wares to market, and demand that for their sake a whole nation shall be left in bondage as rebels, and robbers, and murderers. Still, a section of the press helps to further their base designs; a government is still found in league with them; and still the questions which Judge Fletcher asked remain unanswered, seventy-two years after he spoke: "Is there no method of allaying those discontents of the people and preventing them from flying in the face of the

laws? Is there no remedy but Act of Parliament after Act of Parliament in quick succession, framed for coercing and punishing? Is there no corrective but the rope and the gibbet?"

It is in the hope that it may help to induce the English, Scotch, and Welsh people to answer those questions, as the overwhelming majority of the Irish people have long since answered them for themselves, that this remarkable charge is now reprinted.

To bring the charge within reasonable limits, some passages have been omitted which do not bear against the general tenor of Judge Fletcher's remarks. The punctuation, "capitalizing," and orthography of the original have for the most part been retained. Passages have, for clearness and emphasis, been italicized.

J. J. CLANCY.

Dublin, December, 1886.

MR. BARON FLETCHER'S CHARGE
TO THE
GRAND JURY OF THE COUNTY OF WEXFORD IN 1814.

WEXFORD GOADED INTO REBELLION.

* * * * *

Gentlemen, it is matter of great congratulation, that after a period of 30 years (at the commencement of which I first knew the county Wexford), I have reason to say, it is precisely in the situation in which it was then, except as to an increase of wealth and population, and an improvement in agriculture, which has ameliorated its condition and multiplied its resources. The county of Wexford was then a moral curiosity. When other parts of the country were lawless and disturbed, this County had a Peasantry—industrious in their habits—social in their disposition—satisfied with their state, and amenable to the Laws—cultivating their farms, with an assiduity, which insured a competency. Their conduct was peaceful—their apparel whole—their morals improved—their lives spent in the frequent interchange of mutual good offices. It was a state of things which I reflect upon with pleasure. Each succeeding Circuit showed me wild heaths and uncultivated tracts, brought under the dominion of the plough, and producing corn for the sustenance of man. As it was then, so it continued for many years; until those unhappy disturbances, which burst out in this Country, with such a sudden and unexpected explosion. I knew what the state of things was then, and how that explosion was produced. Professionally I knew it: because I enjoyed peculiar advantages of knowledge, which other men did not enjoy. For several years I conducted the prosecutions of the Crown at Wexford; and hence I derived an intimate knowledge of those transactions. Besides I was connected with no party—I was indifferent about party.

But here I stop—I willingly draw a veil over the events of those days, and their causes. God forbid ! that I should tear asunder wounds, which, I hope, are completely and for ever closed.

THE OLD GAME OF MISREPRESENTATION.

I have now been absent from this County twelve years (with the exception of one Assizes, when I came here in the King's commission, but upon that occasion I did not sit, as I now do, in the Crown Court). I can say, however, with the greatest truth, that at no period from my earliest acquaintance with your County, down to the present time, do I remember to have seen it in more profound tranquillity—more perfect peace—more complete security than at present—a state of things indicating a due administration of the laws by Magistrates, neither over zealous and too active on the one hand, nor too negligent and supine on the other. Such, I do hope, is the true and actual state of your County ; for, Gentlemen, I have, I repeat it, no means of knowing the fact, except from the quantity of alleged crimes, the number of persons charged, and the nature of those charges, as are set out in the Calendar. But why, gentlemen, have I entered into this detail ? I answer, for these weighty and cogent reasons—because much exaggeration and misrepresentation have gone abroad ; and the extent and causes of disturbances have been much misstated. In what I now say, or shall say, I do not impute anything to any individual in this County—I will not meddle with its internal politics ; but this I know, that its situation has been variously represented. Several advertisements in newspapers, now before me—[the Wexford Journals of last March and April]—describe this County as being in a most alarming state of disturbance. Other advertisements affirm, on the other hand, that the County has never enjoyed more profound tranquillity. These advertisements have been, I understand, re-published in the Prints of Dublin and London ; and have naturally excited strong sensations. It is not for me to inquire into the motive of those opposite statements, I know them not. It is not my intention—

it is not my duty, to impute any particular motives to any individuals ; but it is within the sphere of my public duty to state, for your instruction, what I have observed as the origin and grounds of similar reports and misrepresentations in other Counties, whither the discharge of my public duty has called me ; and where I have had judicial knowledge of what has passed. It may be not uninstructive to state, what appeared to me to be the causes of those disturbances, which have occasioned those misrepresentations and exaggerations—together with the reasons which have impelled the Legislature to swell the Criminal Code, session after session, with new Statutes for vindicating the peace of this country.

A REBUKE TO THE OUTRAGE MANUFACTURERS.

In my circuits through other parts of the Kingdom, I have seen the lower orders of the People disturbed by many causes, not peculiar to any particular Counties—operating with more effect in some : but to a greater or less extent in all—I have seen them operating with extended effect in the North-West Circuit, in the Counties of Mayo, Donegal, Derry, Roscommon, etc. These effects have made a deep impression on my mind. My observations, certainly, have been those of an individual—but of an individual, seeing the same facts coming before him, judicially, time after time—and I do now publicly state, that never, during the entire period of my judicial experience (comprising sixteen Circuits) have I discovered or observed any serious purpose, or settled scheme of assailing his Majesty's Government, or any conspiracy connected with internal rebels, or foreign foes. But various, deep-rooted, and neglected causes, producing similar effects throughout this Country, have conspired to create the evils which really and truly do exist.

THE REAL CAUSES OF OUTRAGE AND MISERY.

First, the extraordinary rise of land occasioned by the great and encreasing demand for the necessaries of life ; and by producing large profits to the possessors of farms, excited a

proportionate avidity for acquiring or renting lands. Hence extravagant rents have been bid for lands, without any great consideration ; and I have seen these two circumstances operating upon each other, like cause and effect—the cause producing the effect ; and the effect, by re-action producing the cause.

Next, we all know, that the Country has been deluged by an enormous Paper Currency, which has generated a new crime, now prominent upon the list in every calendar—the crime of making and uttering forged Bank Notes. In every Province we have private Banks failing, and ruining multitudes ; and thus have fresh mischiefs flowed from this Paper Circulation. In the next place, the Country has seen a Magistracy, over active in some instances, and quite supine in others. This circumstance has materially affected the administration of the laws in Ireland.

ORANGEISM “POISONS THE FOUNTAINS OF JUSTICE.”

In this respect, I have found that those Societies, called the *Orange Societies*, have produced most mischievous effects ; and particularly in the North of Ireland. *They poison the very Fountains of Justice ; and even some Magistrates, under their influence, have, in too many instances, violated their duty and their oaths.* I do not hesitate to say, that *all* Associations, of every description in this country,—whether of ORANGEMEN or RIBBONMEN—whether distinguished by the colour of *Orange* or of *Green*—*all* combinations of persons, bound to each other (by the obligations of *an oath*) in league for a common purpose, endangering the peace of the Country, I pronounce them to be contrary to law. And should it ever come before me to decide upon the question, I shall not hesitate *to send up Bills of Indictment to a Grand Jury against the individual Members of such an Association, wherever I can find the charge properly sustained.*

THE ORANGE YEOMEN AND ORANGE JURIES.

Of this I am certain, that, so long as those associations are permitted to act in the lawless manner they do, there will be no tranquillity in this country, and particularly in the North of

Ireland. There, those disturbers of the public peace, who assume the name of Orange Yeomen, frequent the fairs and markets, with arms in their hands, under the pretence of self-defence, or of protecting the public peace, but with the lurking view of inviting the attacks of the Ribbonmen—confident, that, armed as they are, they must overcome defenceless opponents and put them down. *Murders have been repeatedly perpetrated upon such occasions; and though legal prosecutions have ensued, yet such have been the baneful consequences of those factious associations, that under their influence, Petty Juries have declined (upon some occasions) to do their duty.* These facts have fallen under my own view. It was sufficient to say—such a man displayed such a colour, to produce an utter disbelief of his testimony; or, when another has stood with his hand at the bar, the display of his party badge has mitigated the murder into manslaughter.

PEACE IMPOSSIBLE WITH ORANGEISM RAMPANT.

Gentlemen, I do repeat, that these are my sentiments, not merely as an individual, but as a man discharging his judicial duty, I hope with firmness and integrity. With these Orange Associations I connect all Commemorations and Processions—producing embittering recollections, and inflicting wounds upon the feelings of others; and I do emphatically state it as my settled opinion, that until those *Associations are effectually put down, and the arms taken from their hands, in vain will the North of Ireland expect tranquillity or peace.*

THE RACK-RENTERS AND THE GRAND JURY JOBBERS.

Gentlemen, that modern pittance, which the high rents leave to the poor Peasantry, the large County Assessments nearly take from them; roads are frequently planned and made, not for the general advantage of the Country; but to suit the particular views of a neighbouring Landholder, at the public expense—such abuses shake the very foundation of the Law—they ought to be checked. Superadded to these mischiefs, are the permanent and

occasional absentee Landlords, residing in another Country, not known to their Tenantry but by their Agents, who extract the uttermost penny of the value of the lands. If a lease happen to fall, they set the farm by public auction to the highest bidder. No gratitude for past services—no preference of the fair offer—no predilection for the ancient tenantry (be they ever so deserving), but if the highest price be not acceded to, the depopulation of an entire tract of country ensues. *What then is the wretched peasant to do? Chased from the spot where he had first drawn his breath—where he had first seen the light of heaven—incapable of procuring any other means of existence—vexed with those exactions I have enumerated—and harassed by the payment of Tithes—can we be surprised, that a peasant, of unenlightened mind, of uneducated habits, should rush upon the perpetration of crimes, followed by the punishment of the rope and the gibbet?* Nothing (as the peasantry imagine) remains for them, thus harassed and thus destitute, but with strong hand to deter the stranger from intruding upon their farms; and to extort from the weakness and terrors of their Landlords (from whose gratitude or good feelings they have failed to win it), a kind of preference for their ancient tenantry.

RIBBONISM A PRODUCT OF OPPRESSION.

Such, Gentlemen, have been the causes which I have thus seen operating in the North of Ireland, and in part of the South and West. I have observed, too, as the consequences of those Orange Combinations and Confederacies, men, ferocious in their habits—uneducated—not knowing what remedy to resort to—in their despair, flying in the face of the Law—entering into dangerous and criminal counter associations, and endeavouring to procure arms, in order to meet upon equal terms, their Orange assailants.

A VINDICATION OF THE PRIESTS.

To these several causes of disturbance, we may add certain moral causes. There has existed an ancient connection, salutary

in its nature, between the Catholic Pastor and his flock. This connection has been often, with very little reflection, inveighed against by those who call themselves friends to the Constitution, in Church and State. I have had judicial opportunities of knowing, that this connection between the Catholic Pastor and his Flock, has been, in some instances, weakened, and nearly destroyed ; the Flock, goaded by their wants, and flying in the face of their Pastor, with a lamentable abandonment of all religious feeling, and a dereliction of all regard to that pastoral superintendence, which is so essential to the tranquillity of the country. For if men have no prospect here, but of a continued series of want and labour, and privation ; and if the hopes and fears of a future state are withdrawn from them, by an utter separation from their own Pastor, what must be the state of society ? The ties of religion and morality being thus loosened, a frightful state of things ensued. Perjury has abounded—the sanctity of oaths has ceased to be binding, save where they administer to the passions of parties. The oaths of the Orange Associations, or of the Ribbonmen, have, indeed, continued to be obligatory. As for Oaths administered in a Court of Justice, they have been set at nought.

GRAND JURY FRAUDS AND MAGISTERIAL PERJURY.

Gentlemen, another deep-rooted cause of immorality has been the operation of the County Presentment Code of Ireland—abused, as it has been, for the purpose of fraud and peculation. Will you not be astonished, when I assure you, that I have had information judicially, from an upright Country Gentleman and Grand Juror of unquestionable veracity in a Western County, that in the general practice, not one in ten of the Accounting Affidavits was actually sworn at all ? Magistrates have signed, and given away printed forms of such Affidavits *in blank*, to be filled up by the pleasure of the party. This abuse produced a strong representation from me to the Grand Jury, and had I known the fact in time, I would have made an example of those

Magistrates who were guilty of so scandalous a dereliction of duty. Another source of immorality may be traced in the Registry of Freeholds. Oaths of Registration are taken, which, if not perjury, are something very near it. *The tenantry are driven to the Hustings, and there collected like sheep in a pen, they must poll for the great undertaker, who has purchased them by his jobs; and this is frequently done, with little regard to conscience or duty, or real value for the alleged freehold.*

Another source of immorality lay in the hasty mode of pronouncing Decrees upon Civil Bills, which was common before Assistant Barristers were nominated for the several counties. All these concurring causes, however, created such a contempt for oaths, that I have often lamented it to be my painful lot to preside in a court of justice, and be obliged to listen to such abominable profanation.

DRAWING RENTS FROM ILLICIT WHISKEY.

I now come to another source of vice and mischief, with which you are, perhaps, unacquainted,—“Illicit Distillation.” From this source, a dreadful torrent of evils and crimes has flowed upon our land. *The excessive encrease of rents has induced many persons to bid rents for their farms, which they knew they could not fairly or properly discharge—but they flattered themselves, that, in the course of years the value of those farms would rise still higher, and that thus they might ultimately acquire beneficial interests.* In the meantime they have had recourse to Illicit Distillation, as the means of making good their rents. Hence the Public Revenue has been defrauded to the amount of millions. Nay, it is a fact, that at one period, not far back, there was not a single licensed Distillery in an entire Province—namely, the North-West Circuit, where the consumption of spirituous liquors is, perhaps, called for by the coldness and humidity of the climate. The old powers of the law having proved unavailing, the Legislature was compelled to enact new laws, which, though clashing with the very first principles of

evidence under our happy Constitution, were yet called for by the exigency of the times—laws which qualify a prosecutor to be a witness in his *own* cause. If he feared not the consequences of perjury, he gained the suit, and put the money into his pocket. Hence a kind of bounty was necessarily tendered to false swearing ; and we all know the Revenue folk are not very remarkable for a scrupulous feeling in such cases. These oaths were answered again by the oaths of the parties charged, who, in order to avoid the fine, denied the existence of any still upon their lands. Thus have I witnessed trials, where in my judgment, the Revenue Officer who came to impose the fine, was perjured—the witnesses who came to avert it, perjured—and the petty Jury who tried the cause, perjured, for they declined to do their duty, because they were, or might be interested in the event ; or because the easy procurement of those illicit spirits produced an encreased consumption of grain for their benefit. The resident gentry of the country, generally, winked with both their eyes at this practice, and why ?—because it brought home to the doors of their tenantry a market for their corn ; *and consequently encreased the rents of their lands*—besides they were themselves consumers of those liquors, and in every town and village there was an unlicensed house for retailing them. This consumption of spirits produced such pernicious effects that the Executive powers deemed it high time to put an end to the system. The consequence was, that the people, rendered ferocious by the use of those liquors, and accustomed to lawless habits, resorted to force, resisted the laws, opposed the military, and hence have resulted riots, assaults and murders.

THE ABSENTEES.

Can you wonder, that, in such a immoral state of things, all tranquillity and obedience to the law were banished from those counties ? Absentees, too, have increased ; disgusted with the state of things, they desert their posts in the time of peril : but yet, should the farm happen to fall out of lease, keeping strict

eye that it be set up to the highest bidder. These things have produced disturbances everywhere ; but, gentlemen, whether they apply to your county, to any extent, or at all, is for your consideration.

Gentlemen, I hope the system of setting Lands by auction—of squeezing from the vitals of the tenantry more than the actual value of the produce of the land, does not exist in this County. I hope and believe no such system prevails here—because *like causes produce like effects* ; and in that case the Calendar now before me would have exhibited a very different picture.

*

*

*

*

IS THERE NO REMEDY BUT COERCION ?

But, Gentlemen, is there no method of allaying those discontents of the people, and preventing them from flying in the face of the Laws ? Is there no remedy but Act of Parliament after Act of Parliament, in quick succession, framed for coercing and punishing ? Is there no corrective but the Rope and the Gibbet ? Yes, Gentlemen, the removal of those causes of disturbance, which I have mentioned to you, will operate as the remedy. I should imagine, that the permanent Absentees ought to see the *policy* (if no better motive can influence them) of appropriating, liberally, some part of those splendid revenues, which they draw from this Country—which pay no Land Tax or Poor’s Rate—and of which not a shilling is expended in this Country ! Is it not high time for those permanent absentees, to offer some assistance originating from themselves out of their own private purses, towards improving and ameliorating the condition of the lower orders of the peasantry upon their great domains, and rendering their lives more comfortable. Indeed, I believe, that some of them do not set up their lands to auction. I know that the Earl Fitzwilliam in one county, (Wicklow) and the Marquis of Hertford in another, (Antrim) act upon enlightened and liberal principles ; for, although their leases, generally, are only leases for one life and twenty-one years, the tenant in possession well knows, that, upon

a reasonable advance (merely proportionate to the general rise of the times), he will get his farm without rack-rent or extortion. But, I say, that the permanent absentees ought to know, that it is their interest to contribute everything in their power, and within the sphere of their extensive influence, towards the improvement of a country, from whence they derive such ample revenues and solid benefits. Instead of doing so, how do many of them act ? They often depute their Managers upon the Grand Jury of the County. This Manager gets his jobs done without question or interruption ; his roads, and his bridges, and his park walls are all conceded.

How ENGLISH VISITORS ARE DELUSED.

For my part, I am wholly at a loss to conceive how those permanent Absentees can reconcile it to their feelings or their interests to remain silent spectators of such a state of things—or how they can forbear to raise their voices in behalf of their unhappy Country, and attempt to open the eyes of our English Neighbours ; who, generally speaking, know about as much of the Irish, as they do of the Hindoos. Does a visitor come to Ireland, to compile a book of Travels, what is his course ? He is handed about from one country gentleman to another, all interested in concealing from him the true state of the Country ; he passes from 'Squire to 'Squire, each rivalling the other in entertaining their guest—all busy in pouring falsehoods into his ears, touching the disturbed state of the country, and the vicious habits of the people. Such is the crusade of information, upon which the English traveller sets forward ; and he returns to his own country with all his unfortunate prejudices doubled and confirmed—in a kind of moral despair of the welfare of such a wicked race, having made up his mind that nothing ought to be done for this lawless and degraded country. And, indeed, to such an extravagant excess have those intolerant opinions of the state of Ireland attained, that I shall not be surprised to hear of some political projector coming forward, and renovating the obsolete ignorance and the prejudices of a Harrington, who, in his *Oceana*, calls the people

of Ireland an untameable race ; declaring, that they ought to be exterminated, and the country colonized by Jews ; that thus the state of this island would be bettered, and the commerce of England extended and improved.

A CONTRAST.

Gentlemen, I will tell you what those absentees ought particularly to do—they ought to promote the establishment of Houses of Refuge, Houses of Industry and School Houses, and set the example, upon their own estates, of building decent cottages, so that the Irish peasant may have, at least, the comforts of an “ English Sow ;” for an English farmer would refuse to eat the flesh of a hog, so lodged and fed as an Irish peasant is. Are the farms of an English landholder out of lease, or his cottages in a state of dilapidation ?—he rebuilds every one of them for his tenants, or he covenants to supply them with materials for the purpose. But, how are matters conducted in this Country ? Why, if there is a house likely to fall into ruins, upon an expiring lease, the new rack-rent tenant must rebuild it himself ; and can you wonder, if your plantations are visited by them, or if your young trees are turned into plough-handles, spade handles, or roofs for their cabins ? They are more than Egyptian task-masters, who call for bricks without furnishing a supply of straw. Again I say, that those permanent absentees ought to come home, and not remain abroad, resting upon the local manager, a species of “ *locum tenens* ” upon the Grand Jury. They should reside upon their estates, and come forward with every possible improvement for the benefit of the country.

GOOD ADVICE.

So much, Gentlemen, for Landlords, permanent and occasional Absentees. You should begin the necessary reformation. You now enjoy comforts and tranquillity after seasons of storm, and fever, and disturbance. The comparative blessings should make you anxious to keep your county tranquil. If your farms fall out

of lease, set them not up to be let by public auction—encourage your tenantry to build comfortable dwellings for themselves—give them a property in their farms, and an interest in the peace of the county. These are the remedies for the discontents of the people—they will be found much better than the cord and the gibbet.

MAGISTERIAL INIQUITIES.

Here let me solicit your particular attention to some of the most grievous mischief, flowing from the misconduct of certain Magistrates. One is occasioned by an excessive eagerness to crowd the gaols with prisoners, and to swell the calendars with crimes. Hence the amazing disproportion between the number of committals and convictions—between accusation and evidence—between hasty suspicion and actual guilt. Committals have been too frequently made out (in other counties) upon light and trivial grounds, without reflecting upon the evil consequences of wresting a peasant (probably innocent) from the bosom of his family—imprisoning him for weeks or months in a noisome gaol, amongst vicious companions. He is afterwards acquitted, or not prosecuted; and returns a lost man, both in health and morals, to his ruined and beggared family. This is a hideous, but *common* picture.

Again, fines and forfeited recognizances are multiplied, through the misconduct of a magistrate. He binds over a prosecutor under a heavy recognizance, to attend at a distant assizes, where, it is probable that, the man's poverty or private necessities must prevent his attending. The man makes default—his recognizance is forfeited—he is committed to the County Gaol upon a Green Wax Process—and, after long confinement, he is finally discharged at the assizes, pursuant to the statute; and, from an industrious cottier, he is degraded, from thenceforth, into a beggar and a vagrant.

Other magistrates presume to make out vague committals, without specifying the day of the offence charged, the place, or any other particular, from which the unfortunate prisoner could

have notice to prepare his defence. This suppression is highly indecorous, unfeeling, and unjust, and deserves upon every occasion a severe reprobation of the magistrate, who thus deprives his fellow-subject of his rightful opportunity of defence.

There are parts of Ireland, where, from the absence of the gentlemen of the county, a race of magistrates has sprung up, who ought never to have borne the King's Commission. The vast powers entrusted to those officers, call for an upright, zealous, and conscientious discharge of their duty.

THE TITHES.

Gentlemen, as to Tithes, they are generally complained of as a great grievance. In the times in which we live, they are a tax upon industry, upon enterprize, and upon agricultural skill. Is a man intelligent and industrious—does he, by agriculture reclaim a tract of land, and make it productive of corn, he is visited and harassed by the Tithe Proctor; does his neighbour, through want of inclination or of skill, keep his farm in pasture and unimproved, he is exonerated from the burden of Tithes, and from the visitations of any clergy not belonging to his own Church. Far be it from me to say, that Tithes are not due the Clergy. By the law of the land, they have as good a title to their Tithes as any of you have to your estates; and I am convinced, that the clergyman does not, in any instance, exact what he is not strictly entitled to. But this mode of assessment has been much complained of, and it is particularly so in this country, because the Catholic receives no spiritual comfort from his Protestant Rector; he knows him only through the Tithe Proctor, and he has, moreover, his own pastor to pay. This is the reason why he thinks it a grievance; and, I must admit, that, although the clergyman does not receive all that he is entitled to, and although it may not be a grievance in another country, yet the Tithe system is a painful system for Ireland.

GRAND JURY JOBBERY.

Gentlemen, you have in your power another remedy for

public commotions—I allude to the assessment of the Presentments—money upon your county. It seems that the sum of 9,000*l.* is now demanded to be levied ; whether this sum is, or is not an exorbitant one for this county, I know not. It is a tax, of which you will impose the greater part, or, perhaps, the whole upon your county—and it falls wholly upon the occupying tenants or farmers ; pray keep this circumstance constantly in your minds—the benefit of this tax is your own. By its operation, you have your farms well divided and improved—good roads made round your estates—useful bridges and walls erected. Indeed, I have known counties, which have been parcelled out to undertakers by baronies, and where no man could get a job without the consent of the baronial undertaker—they met and commuted—and it was thus agreed—“I give you your job here, and you give me my job there.” I may be asked, why do I mention these things ? the Grand Jury know them very well—but then they ought to be concealed. Miserable, infatuated notion ! These things are not concealed ; there is not a Grand Jury job in the county which is not known and commented upon by the peasantry. Every mischief, and every enormity I have this day stated, is as thoroughly well known to the peasantry, as to the gentry, throughout Ireland. The affected apprehension of exciting and exasperating them, by a reprobation of those enormities, is puerile and contemptible. It cannot do mischief—it cannot add to the poignancy of their feelings—it may allay or soothe them—already those exactions are the subject of discussion, and of minute scrutiny, in every cabin ; what are the consequences ?—dreadful heart burnings, and deep murmers—the visit of the constable who collects the Cess, is a day of general mourning, and distress, and tribulation. I spoke freely of these things to the Grand Jury of the County of Tipperary ; what was the beneficial result ? The Foreman, (Mr. Bagwell) came forward soon afterwards from the Grand Jury-room, and stated publicly in court, that, in consequence of my charge, he and his fellow jurors, had thrown out applications for presentments to the amount of 9,600*l.* These may

be presumed to be jobs, under pretence of building walls and bridges, filling hollows, lowering hills, etc. Here, indeed, was some good done by this sudden impulse of economy—here were the fruits of a free and candid exhortation before the public eye.

Gentlemen, the judge, whose duty it is to pass the Presentments, can be of little service towards detecting a “Job”—he has no local knowledge—he knows not the distances—the rates—the state of repairs—or the views of the parties.—He may indeed, suspect the job, and tear the suspected presentment; but he may tear, inadvertently, that which is useful, and let the job pass. Therefore, for the sake of the County, do as Mr. Bagwell did at Clonmel.—Begin the reformation, and discountenance firmly all parcelling of “Jobs.”

Gentlemen, when I visited the House of Industry at Clonmel, (which is liberally and conscientiously conducted by an association, consisting of persons of every Religious persuasion, with the Protestant Parson and the Catholic Priest at their head)—never did my eyes witness a more blessed sight. I immediately asked “What do you pay to the Matron, and to the Manager ?” The sum was mentioned—it was small. “I suppose,” said I, “it is no object of a County job.” Mr. Grubb—the benevolent Mr. Grubb smiled, and said, “your have hit it, my Lord—that is the fact.”

“A TAINTED MAGISTRACY.”

But there is one remedy, that would, in my estimation, more than any other, especially contribute to soothe the minds of the discontented peasantry, and, thereby, enable them patiently to suffer the pressure of those burthens, which cannot, under existing circumstances, be effectually removed—I mean the “equal and impartial administration of justice”—of that justice which the rich can pursue, until it be attained ; but which, that it may benefit the cottager, should be brought home to his door. Such an administration of justice would greatly reconcile the lower orders of the people, with the Government under which they live ; and, at no very distant period, I hope, attach them to the

law, by imparting its benefits, and extending its protection to them, in actual and uniform experience. Gentlemen, if you ask me, how this may be accomplished, I answer, by a vigilant superintendence of the administration of justice at Quarter Sessions, and an anxious observance of the conduct of all Justices of Peace. Perhaps, the Commission of the Peace in every county in the Kingdom, should be examined. During a long war, in seasons of popular commotion, under chief governors (all acting, unquestionably, with good intentions, but upon various principles and different views), it is not improbable, that many men have crept into the commission, who, however useful they might occasionally have been, ought not to remain. The needy adventurer—the hunter for preferment—the intemperate zealot—the trader in false loyalty—the jobbers of absentees—if any of these various descriptions of individuals are now to be found, their names should be expunged from the commission; and if such a mode of proceeding should thin the commission, vacancies might be supplied, by soliciting every Gentleman of property and consideration to discharge some part of that debt of duty, which he owes to himself and the country, by accepting the office of Justice of the Peace. Should their number be inadequate to supply the deficiency, Clergymen, long resident on their benefices—inclined to follow the precepts of their Divine Master by feeding the hungry and clothing the naked Catholic (although adhering to the communion of his fathers, he should conscientiously decline to receive from him spiritual consolation)—not harassing and vexing by a new mode of tithing, and an encrease of tithes; but seeking to compensate the Dissentients from his communion for the income he derives from their labour, by shewing a regard for their temporal welfare—attached to their Protestant flocks by a mutual interchange of good offices, by affection, and by habit. Such a man, anxiously endeavouring, not to distract and divide, but to conciliate and reconcile all sects and parties, would from his education, his leisure, his local knowledge, be a splendid acquisition to the magistracy, and a

public blessing to the district committed to his care. Men of this description are retired and unobtrusive ; but, I trust, if sought after, many such may be found. Persons there have been of a sort, differing widely from those I have described. These men identify their preferment with the welfare of the Church ; and if you had believed them, whatever advanced the one, necessarily promoted the other. Some clergymen there may have been, who in a period of distraction, perusing the Old Testament with more attention than the New ; and admiring the glories of Joshua, (the son of Nun,) fancied they perceived in the Catholics, the Canaanites of old ; and, at the head of Militia and armed Yeomanry, wished to conquer from them the promised glebe. Such men, I hope, are not now to be found in that most respectable order ; and, if they are, I need scarcely add, they should no longer remain in the commission.

SPURIOUS LOYALTY.

Gentlemen, I must further admonish you, if you are infested with any of the Orange or Green* Associations in this county, to discharge them—discourage all Processions and Commemorations connected with them, and you will promote the peace and concord of the county. But suffer them to prevail, and how can justice be administered ? “ I am a loyal man,” says a witness—that is, “ Gentlemen of the Petty Jury, believe me, let me swear what I will.” When he swears he is a loyal man, he means, “ Gentlemen of the Jury, forget your oaths and acquit the Orangeman.” A truly loyal man is one who is attached to the Constitution under which we live, and who respects and is governed by the laws, which impart more personal freedom, when properly administered, than any other code of laws in existence. If there are disturbances in the country, the truly loyal man endeavours to appease them. The truly loyal man is peaceful and quiet. He does his utmost to prevent commotion ; and, if he cannot prevent it, he is at his post, ready to perform

* He refers to the Ribbon Societies.

his duty in the day of peril. But what says a loyal man of another description—the mere pretender to loyalty?—“I am a loyal man, in times of tranquillity. I am attached to the present order of things, as far as I can get any good by it. I malign every man of a different opinion from those whom I serve. *I bring my loyalty to market.*” Such loyalty has borne lower or higher prices, according to the different periods of modern times. He exposes it to sale in open market, at all times—seeking continually for a purchaser.

Such are the pretenders to loyalty, many of whom I have seen; and incalculable mischiefs they perpetrate.—It is not their interest that their country should be peaceful; their loyalty is a sea of troubled waters.

*

*

*

*

COERCION.

Gentlemen, two Bills, of importance to the public peace of Ireland, have recently passed both Houses of Parliament, almost, as I believe, without observation; and, certainly, without public enquiry into the state of the country. Having formed an opinion upon the causes of popular discontents, and public commotions in those counties, which I have, within these five years visited, I thought it expedient, openly from this place, to state this opinion; hoping, that my judgment being founded, not upon secret whisperings or private communications, but upon the solemnity of public trials and the authenticity of public records, may have some weight towards suggesting the expediency of resorting to other means of tranquillizing Ireland, than those hitherto resorted to—*Banishment*, the *Rope*, and the *Gibbet*. These expedients have been repeatedly tried; and have, by the acknowledgment of those who have used them, hitherto proved ineffectual. And here I must entreat, that I may not be wilfully mistaken and purposely misunderstood by any man, or class of men. I mean not to question, in the slightest degree, the prudence of the Irish Government in introducing, or the wisdom of

the Legislature in enacting, those laws : they may be suitable for anything I know to the contrary to the existing state of things in some of those counties, where the discharge of my public duty has not yet called me. In others, although it may not be immediately necessary to put them into active operation, the notoriety of their existence in the Statute Book may be a wholesome warning to the turbulent and audacious. But having, in addressing you, taken occasion to give you my opinions upon different subjects (the statement of which, however erroneous those opinions should appear to be, may produce some good by soliciting the attention of the enlightened men in both countries, to the same subjects), I feel myself more especially called upon, by a sense of public duty, to say a few words to you, upon the scope and object of those Bills—I say, more especially called upon, by reason of those important, though contradictory publications, in the Wexford Journals, now laid before me ; and to which I have already adverted. Whence that contradiction of sentiment could originate, between persons resident in the same county, and having (one would imagine) equal opportunities of information, it is not for me to conjecture ; but its indisputable existence in the months of March and April last (subsequently to your last Assizes), calls upon me, briefly to explain to you the purport of those acts, which some of you may deem it expedient to call into active operation.

THE INSURRECTION ACT.

With one of those acts you have had a former acquaintance. It is the old Insurrection Act, which after having perished, is now revived and re-enacted for Ireland. The other is called the Peace Preservation Bill. The Insurrection Act consists, as you all know, of a complete suspension of the English Constitution—of English Law—of the Trial by Jury. Under these new Laws, taken together, any seven Magistrates may meet and recommend the County, or District, to be proclaimed by the Lord Lieutenant, as being in a state of disturbance. When the Proclamation has once

issued, every person must stay at home after a certain hour. You are to have the assistance of a learned Serjeant from town, who may send abroad offenders, in a summary way.

Gentlemen, I have seen times, when persons, who thinking the lives named in their tenants' leases were lasting somewhat too long, have, by the aid of such a Law, found means to recommend a trip across the Atlantic, to the persons thus unreasonably attached to life ; and thus achieved the downfall of a beneficial lease, and a comfortable rise of their income in consequence. Such things have occurred—I have known the fact.

A “PEACE PRESERVATION ACT.”

Gentlemen, the other Act of Parliament is the Peace Preservation Bill. It is a wholesome mode of administering the old powers, already vested by law in the magistrates. Any seven magistrates may recommend the application of this remedy ; and either for the county at large, or any particular barony or district in the county. If their recommendation should be acceded to by the Lord Lieutenant, this Bill comes into immediate operation. Now, you are to meet—a head magistrate is to be appointed at a salary of 700*l.* a year ; he is also to have a house and offices—his clerk is to get a salary of 150*l.* a year--the constables are to get 100*l.* a year each—any seven of your magistrates may get all this done. But listen to one thing more ; the disturbed district is to pay the expense of the whole.

“BOGUS” OUTRAGES.

Gentlemen, I have trespassed long upon your attention ; but I hope, from the tranquil state of your County, that I have not unaptly chosen the present season for making those observations. See the necessity of some public discussion of these subjects, in order to extinguish all exaggeration and misrepresentation. I need not travel far back for a curious instance. I have seen, to my surprise, in the *Courier* Newspaper, a story of myself, which has been copied into the *Pilot*. It is so very short that I shall

read it : " Such is the disturbed state of Ireland, that one of the Judges of Assize, upon the Leinster Circuit, Mr Justice Fletcher, in coming from Kilkenny to Clonmel, was pelted by stones in the Town of Callan, and owed his safety to the dragoons that escorted him."

When I reached Waterford, I was still more surprised to see one newspaper lamenting that I had been " shot at," but another protested it was all a gross falsehood ; now, what was the truth ? As I passed through Callan, an escort of a few dragoons attended me. This escort, by the bye, is one of the mischiefs of those alarms ; a mischief which never occurs in England. There the gentlemen of consideration in the county come out to meet the Judge, with led horses and equipages, and with every suitable mark of respect and attention ; not, indeed, paid to the judge individually, nor desired by him, but an attention and respect due to the Law, which the Judge comes to administer. But what was the case in Kilkenny ? The High Sheriff not appearing at all ; perhaps, as a duty beneath him, or for some other reason ; the Sub-Sheriff unwilling enough to be burdened with the trouble, and anxious to get rid of us ; two or three miserable bailiffs mounted upon wretched little horses, brandishing an enormous length of halbert, resembling so many Cossacks in everything but utility ; and attended by an escort of four or five dragoons (for the Sheriff is not at the expense of paying the dragoons). Indeed, where needy or penurious High Sheriffs are nominated, and where the office of Sub-Sheriff becomes an affair of indirect management, an improper and inefficient attendance upon the Circuit Judges is generally to be expected ; however, thus attended, or rather unattended, we drove through Callan ; when a boy, about *seven years old*, flung a stone idly, either at the Sub-Sheriff or at the dragoons, or both. *This was the entire outrage.* I did not hear of it, until long afterwards, when the Newspaper paragraphs led me to the inquiry ; but my servants are ready to vouch the fact upon oath.

This story, with prodigious exaggeration, has been since

officially circulated throughout the Empire, in order to show, that this country is in such a state of disturbance, that the going Judge of an assize was pelted with stones, or shot at, and in imminent danger of his life. Can any instance more strongly illustrate the propriety, nay even the necessity, of a full and unreserved statement of the true and actual condition of Ireland, than the extraordinary currency which this paltry fabrication has received, and the avidity with which it has been magnified into a momentous and alarming event.

THE OTHER LINE.

Gentlemen, if you should feel that any of these observations are founded in truth and reason, you will give me, at least, the credit of upright motives for those from which you may differ. I can have no other motive, indeed, than a hope of doing some public good by inciting other persons to useful and meritorious actions. Other Judges have very frequently, and with great propriety, charged various Grand Juries upon the state of this country, its disturbances and the causes of its commotion ; and some of them have ascribed those disturbances and commotions to a general spirit of disaffection and sedition. If I have a very different and far more consolatory view of the same subject, it cannot be improper or unbecoming my functions, to take the like opportunity of stating my judicial opinions – of enumerating the several causes, which, in my fixed judgment, have generated these disturbances, and have retarded peace and prosperity in this country ; and distinctly pointing out the remedies and correctives proper for terminating all those mischiefs, and allaying all discontents. These considerations, will, I trust, vindicate as well the motives as the propriety of my conduct in this respect, through every scrutiny, and against every cavil.

The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) **Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill.** By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) **The Orange Bogey.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) **The Chicago Convention.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (4) **The Irish Land Crisis.**
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (5) **The "Castle" System.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (6) **The Truth about '98.** By J. E. REDMOND, M.P. B.L.
- (7) **Irish Industries and English Legislation.**
By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (8) **The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.**
By CHARLES DAWSON, EX-M.P.
- (9) **An Irish Judge on the Irish Question.**
With Introduction by J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P
The Elections of 1885. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
Coercion. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
The Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.
By ALFRED WEBB.
Price One Penny each.
- A Word for Ireland.** By T. M. HEALY, B.L. Price 1s.
- Report on the Present State of the Irish Land Question.**
By A LAND VALUER. Price 6d.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.



Other Tracts in preparation.

No. 10.

The Irish Question.

THE OPINIONS OF SOME PROTESTANTS

REGARDING THEIR

IRISH CATHOLIC FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN:

COLLECTED BY

A L F R E D W E B B.

With the Address of the Irish Protestant Home Rule
Association.

LONDON:

THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1887

Price One Penny.

OPINIONS OF SOME PROTESTANTS, ETC.

[These pages were written in reply to the following query, and are published with the permission of their authors.

“Have you during your experience of life in Ireland observed any instances of intolerance amongst your Catholic friends and neighbours, such as would lead you to fear for your liberty and safety, and for the free exercise of your religion, under an Irish Constitution such as that sketched out in Mr. Gladstone’s Bill ?”]

Cheek Point, Waterford, 12th May, 1886.

In reply to your inquiry, I am an Ulster Protestant, who has lived forty-one years in the most Catholic districts of the south of Ireland. The official position which I occupied during most of that time brought me in contact with Catholics and Protestants indiscriminately, and I never heard or saw, in one single instance, anything on the part of the Catholics not consistent with the most anxious desire to extend to their Protestant fellow-countrymen the most complete equality in regard to civil and religious matters. Many of my most intimate friends are Catholics, and occasionally discussing matters with them, both clerical and laymen, I never heard the faintest approach to anything not breathing perfect charity towards all sides. I may mention that on two occasions I was elected Mayor by an exclusive Catholic vote. In my opinion the most perfect freedom of religion will be allowed to every one under our new constitution now being formed under the auspices of Mr. Gladstone, and I believe the cry of religious intolerance now attempted to be raised is entirely a political one, brought forward for the purpose of defeating the attainment of the restoration of our National Legislature.

JOHN ALLINGHAM.

[Town Councillor of the Waterford Corporation ; past Mayor ; and late Manager of the Provincial Bank, Waterford.]

Dunmanway, Co. Cork, 11th May, 1886.

During my life, wholly spent in Ireland, and especially during sixteen years of it passed in districts of the south, in which the vast majority of the people are Roman Catholics, I have never met a single instance of religious intolerance on the part of my Roman Catholic neighbours. My experience of life amongst them records nothing but very constant kindness and courtesy.

R. O. N. ANDERSON, B.A., Rector of Drinagh.

91 South Mall, Cork, 11th May, 1886.

In reply to your favour of the 6th instant, after twenty-five years' experience in general business, and having travelled over the entire south of Ireland, frequently every year for the past ten years, and having thereby acquired a thorough and intimate knowledge of the people, mostly Catholics, my experience has been that I never found the fact of my being a Protestant to militate against me. I have never experienced the least intolerance from my Catholic friends, but, on the contrary, the greatest toleration and kindness, and I have not the least fear to trust my civil and religious liberty into the hands of my Catholic fellow-countrymen under such a constitution as sketched out in Mr. Gladstone's Bill.

RICHARD A. ATKINS,

[Merchant; Railway Agent; Town Councillor in the Cork Corporation.]

6 De Vesci-terrace, Kingstown, 13th May, 1886.

Having lived in Ireland upwards of twelve years, and during that time come into contact with all sorts and conditions of my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, I can truly say that I have seen nothing whatever in their conduct that would lead me to fear for my liberty or safety, or for the free exercise of my religious convictions under an Irish constitution such as that sketched out in Mr. Gladstone's Bill. On the contrary, the opinion I have formed from a rather ex-

tensive acquaintance and from frequent intercourse with my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens in different grades of society, on numerous committees, and in scientific and philanthropic societies, is that whilst as a rule they are a deeply religious people they respect the religious convictions of others. Only against proselytism and “perverts” are they bitter and intolerant, and this naturally in proportion to the intensity of their own religious zeal and narrowness of view ; but even here I do not think they are more intolerant than zealous Irish Protestants would be under similar provocation.

W. F. BARRETT.

[Professor in the Royal College of Science, Dublin.]

Fassaroe, Bray, 15th May, 1886.

I have the greatest confidence in the good sense of my Catholic fellow-countrymen, and know of no instances of intolerance amongst my Catholic friends and neighbours. I withhold my opinion on Mr. Gladstone’s Bill.

RICHARD M. BARRINGTON, LL.B.

1 Great George’s-street, Cork, 11th May, 1886.

I have never experienced personally, or observed amongst my neighbours, any intolerance on the part of Catholics towards their Protestant fellow-countrymen. Any intolerance I have felt or observed has been of a political nature, and in my experience chiefly directed against Protestants by their extreme Conservative and Orange co-religionists. I have no fear for my liberty and safety, and for the free exercise of my religion under Home Rule as proposed by Mr. Gladstone. I have resided in Cork since my birth, and for ten or twelve years have mixed largely with Catholics, both in college and in my profession, and count some of them amongst my personal friends.

W. E. BURCHILL, B.E.

[School and Private Teacher.]

Philipstown, King's County, 13th May, 1886.

In reply to your question, I beg to say that I have resided in Ireland all my life. I have never observed an instance of intolerance amongst my Catholic neighbours, but, on the contrary, kindness and toleration, which my Catholic friends not only express but act up to. I believe (and my belief is shared by most Protestants here) that we have nothing to fear from our Catholic fellow-countrymen. We ought to be able to form a correct opinion, as we are in these parts the few amongst the many. I believe that under an Irish constitution such as that sketched out in Mr. Gladstone's Bill the country would settle down, and calmly and dispassionately exercise that political power to which it would become entitled, and that every man would be in the full enjoyment of the blessings of freedom and the privileges of citizenship.

HENRY MINCHIN CLARKE, J.P., Medical Officer.

54 Drumcondra-road, 19th May, 1886.

As an Irish Protestant, I have no fear for the safety or interests of individual Protestants or Protestantism in Ireland, in the event of Mr. Gladstone's projected constitution for Ireland becoming an accomplished fact; on the contrary, I, as a sincere member of our Church, believe that much good would result from the removal of influences that at present hamper its work. I have for many years, in business and private relationships, come in contact with my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen of all classes and standing, and have failed to discern in the whole range of national politics the existence of an ultramontane party who would read Home Rule "Rome Rule." "Catholic intolerance" is only used as a "bogey" by bigots or knaves to frighten fools. Personally I never experienced anything but courtesy and consideration from my Roman Catholic neighbours and friends. As an instance, I

may mention that the important branch of the National Registration Association in the district, unanimously elected me, the only Protestant member of the committee, president for the ensuing year (passing over many Roman Catholic members, who from ability, political standing, and position, were far more entitled to the honour)—thus proving their practical adherence to the doctrine of toleration.

ARTHUR H. CRANWILL.

16 Cook-street, Cork, 11th May, 1886.

Yours to hand, and in reply I beg to say I have been at business since 1871, and this portion of my life may be divided into three parts—1, A period of two years, during which I was an officer in the late Munster Bank (more than half that time under a Catholic manager) ; 2, A period extending over eleven years, when I was manager and apprentice to three different solicitors in this city (one Catholic and two Protestants) ; and 3, A period of two and a-quarter years to present, when practising on my own account. During the entire of these periods I have had frequent opportunities of studying the matter to which you refer, and forming opinions thereon, as I have been very often in contact with Roman Catholics of every grade of society, and I have never found anything even approaching to intolerance ; on the contrary, I have found all those it has been my fortune to be acquainted with, most ready to hold out the hand of fellowship, and I have formed with several friendships which I hope will endure for many years to come. My most intimate friends during my student days were Catholics, and ever since I have been at work on my own account large numbers of Catholics have retained me to act for them. I have for many years held very decided views on the subject of Home Rule, and I have no fear for my liberty, safety, or the free exercise of my religion under an Irish constitution. On the contrary, I feel convinced that

were the irritations now existing removed, all members of the community would work harmoniously together, and that a glorious future would open up for our country.

JOHN E. L. DOWMAN, Solicitor.

80, Abbey-street, Dublin, 11th May, 1886.

I have now lived in Ireland, as you know, for a long period, for more than thirty years, and have had control of a large and very increasing business, with branches all over Ireland. I have never known an instance of Catholic intolerance towards me personally, nor towards the business I have governed, nor does memory recall any case of intolerance from Catholics coming under my own knowledge at any time. I shall not have the slightest fear to entrust my own liberties and those of my family to the control of an Irish Home Rule Parliament in connection with the Bill of Mr. Gladstone.

CHARLES EASON.

[Of the firm of Charles Eason & Son, successors in Ireland to
W. H. Smith & Son, Publishers and Booksellers.]

Great Cressingham, Norfolk, 12th May, 1886.

I have never met with any instance of the kind. My knowledge of Ireland is based on lengthened visits to particular places, and on travels extending over a large part of the island. Moreover, though born and bred in England, I have always mixed much with Irish people of all ranks, and have watched the bearing of one class and creed towards another. In Western Kerry and in Islington (near London) I have seen ill-feeling, but in both cases it was caused by very injudicious attempts at proselytism, and was not at all of the kind which "threatens liberty or safety." It was only due to the wish to be let alone. Of course Irish Catholics feel strongly about denominational education, but not a whit more strongly than the Anglican clergy and many of the dissenting

sects in England. Some of my dearest friends are Irish Catholics, and assured as I am of their wide tolerance, and believing them to represent the mind of their co-religionists, I cannot imagine that the free exercise of Protestantism would be at all endangered under such Home Rule as Mr. Gladstone has sketched out.

HENRY STUART FAGAN, M.A.

[Late Rector Pembr. Coll. Oxford ; Rector Great Cressingham, Norfolk.]

Bedford House, Listowel, 20th May, 1886.

As far as my experience goes, I have never met with any intolerance from my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen on account of my religion. I don't think that a well-devised scheme for giving Irishmen the management of their own affairs would be attended with any evil consequences through bigotry on the Roman Catholic side.

GEORGE FITZMAURICE, Clk., B.A. T.C.D.

Trieneragh, Listowel, 14th April, 1886.

In reply to your letter of the 13th instant, I beg to state that I have lived in the parish of Duagh close on thirty years, and during that time the most agreeable relations have existed between my family and my Roman Catholic neighbours. I am the only Protestant in the parish, and I have been selected by the ratepayers of the Kilshinane and Trieneragh divisions of the Listowel Union to represent them as P.L.G. for the past eighteen years. I never sought this office; it was actually forced on me by my Catholic neighbours. I may remark that my landlord, who is a Protestant, gave a reduction of thirty per cent. to the other tenants on his estate, but refused it to me for no other reason but because I went into the Land Court to have a fair rent fixed. I would be unable to pay the rent but for remittances sent me from time to time

by my children, who are in America and Australia. I may add that I was served with a writ on the 6th of January, 1886, for the September rent of 1885, and would not be able to meet it only for being assisted by one of my Roman Catholic neighbours.

ADAM FITZELL.

[*The following letter from my old political friend Dr. Richard Grattan, was dictated a few days before his death, in the 98th year of his age.*]

[Drummin House, Carbury, 24th May, 1886.]

During my long life, I have neither observed nor experienced any intolerance from my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, some of whom I am proud to say were intimate friends, and I never had the slightest apprehension that should Repeal be granted, my co-religionists would be treated with injustice or intolerance. I would rather be governed by a parliament of Roman Catholics than a parliament of Orangemen.

RICHARD GRATTAN, M.D.

[Senior Fellow of the College of Physicians, Dublin.]

Ballywalter, Co. Down, 12th May, 1886.

During all my life I never experienced a single instance of intolerance on the part of my Catholic friends and neighbours. From my own personal knowledge, based on a life extending over nearly half a century, I can safely say that as a class the Catholics are as trustworthy, peaceable, and law-abiding as any other section of the community, and when I take into account the way they have been treated and spoken of by those who assumed to be better and of a higher type of humanity, this is no little to be able to state. For my personal safety and liberty and my religion (as a Presbyterian) I fear nothing from the Catholics. The very suggestion of

such a thing is nothing short of insult to a long-suffering, persecuted, and misgoverned people. The Bill now before Parliament, or some such measure as that sketched out by the great and noble W. E. Gladstone for the future government of Ireland is, in my opinion, absolutely necessary as a means (a ladder) whereby to lead up to the remedy of the evils which exist in this unhappy and misunderstood country of ours.

WILLIAM GIBSON, J.P.

Grange, Waterford, 11th May, 1886.

During my residence of over forty years in Ireland, I can say, emphatically, that I have not observed any instances amongst my Catholic friends and neighbours, of religious or other intolerance, such as would lead me to fear for my liberty and safety, or for the free exercise of religion, under an Irish constitution, such as that sketched out in Mr. Gladstone's Bill, or even under a much more democratic form of Home Rule. On any occasion when I have had to do committee or other work with Catholics, I have been treated with marked courtesy and consideration, to a greater degree than I should expect it likely would have been shown to anyone in my position, who was not a Protestant.

EDMUND HARVEY.

[Insurance Agent ; Author of *Irish Grievances* in 1886, and other pamphlets.]

Waterford, 12th May, 1886.

In reply to your inquiry: within an experience of over thirty years of active life I have met with some scattered instances of intolerance among Catholics as I have also among Protestants ; but taking my Catholic fellow-countrymen in the aggregate, I have no hesitation in saying that I do not feel the smallest anxiety as to an interference with person, property, or the free exercise of religion, under the government of an Irish Parliament.

NEWENHAM HARVEY.
[Stockbroker.]

Sydenham Park, Strandtown, Belfast, 31st May, 1886.

I entirely trust my countrymen—the Catholic and Protestant Irish Nationalists, and consider expressions of distrust at this moment a gross blunder, as it gives evidence of incapacity and weakness, very injurious to the commercial credit of individuals perpetrating it.

M. HAMILTON.

Ferns, Co. Wexford, 10th of Fifth-month, 1886.

I have resided in this County (Wexford) for fifty-five years, and I have at all times experienced kindness and good-will from my Roman Catholic neighbours, and do not think, even if they had the power, they would do me any injury, or interfere with my religious liberty. I may say that my father and grandfather lived in Ferns; and I can say that they also had the good-will of their Catholic neighbours. I have travelled over a great part of Ireland on official duty, and my religion was never any hindrance to my business, though mixing with a Catholic population in the south and west of Ireland, so that I do not think there is any desire to persecute Protestants, or that they would be ill-treated by an Irish Parliament.

JONATHAN HAUGHTON, Farmer.

[Late Government Court Valuer.]

9 Warren's-place, Cork, 11th May, 1886.

I am in receipt of your letter of the 6th inst. In reply, I am happy to be able to state that having resided all my life in Ireland, and having a business experience of about twenty years in the country, I have not a scintilla of a fear as regards my personal liberty or religious toleration from my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, should Mr. Gladstone's Bill become law; nor do I think any of my co-religionists need have fear either; on the contrary, I believe there will be in the altered condition of things a more kindly feeling and sympathetic union between all parties and creeds, and I

should hope that very soon religious rancour and bigotry shall become extinct in the country. In business matters I have always found my Roman Catholic customers as reliable in every sense as those of the Protestant faith, and in matters apart from business I have found the former more tolerant than the latter. Indeed, to my own knowledge, Protestant landlords have treated their Protestant tenants more unkindly than their Catholic ones. As instance, some days ago a large respectable Protestant farmer near Clonakilty, was requested to sign a petition against Mr. Gladstone's Bill. He asked on what grounds he should sign it. He was told because the Protestants would not receive fair treatment if Home Rule was carried. "Well," said he, "I have a Protestant landlord, and I am the only Protestant tenant on the estate, and I have always paid my rent as punctually as the rest, and I was the only tenant served with a writ. I don't like this Protestant treatment," said he, "I prefer trusting the Catholics, and I will not sign the paper."

J. H. HUNTER, Merchant.

Mountmellick, 13th May, 1886.

During the twenty-six years I have resided in Queen's Co. I have never seen nor experienced any intolerance from my Roman Catholic neighbours, nor would I have any fear for my liberty and safety, or that I would be interfered with in the exercise of my religion, in case Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill is passed. I was born and reared in Co. Down.

ROBERT H. HARSHAW, Presbyterian Minister.

Plumpton, 13th May, 1886.

No. Yet before I was a year ordained my church was wrecked, the books mutilated, and with the vestments thrown into the sea. There was a cause. I invited *all* the children of the school of which I was a manager to a treat; for being a southerner I knew nothing of northern party spirit. The

Catholics thought I meant to proselytize, but when they discovered their error, a deputation headed by the Parish Priest came and expressed regret, and the act was also denounced from the altar. My experience of Catholics is that they dislike controversy, but are firm in their own belief. If let alone, they will leave alone. Let but the drum cease and the Boyne be allowed to run as a river should, or in other words, let the Protestant minority conduct themselves properly, and my conviction is that the Irish Catholics will not give them the least annoyance. The first thirty years of my life were spent in the four provinces of my native land, the last five of these as a clergyman in Donegal. Since then, here and beyond the seas, I have been in much contact with the Catholic Celt. It is on the knowledge acquired by such experience that I speak, and the judgment of my maturer years is in direct opposition to the training of my earlier days. Italy, France, and Belgium must already have taught even fanatics the unwisdom of religious bigotry. In conclusion, permit me to say, that I am a thorough believer in Home Rule, but without any irritating checks, and that the Land Question especially should be left to the Irish themselves to settle.

H. M. KENNEDY, M.A.
[Vicar of Plumpton, Diocese of Carlisle.]

Cork, 11th May, 1886.

I shall best reply to your question by quoting from a letter that I sent last week on the same subject to the *Northern Whig* :—" All my ministerial life has been spent outside Ulster, in the west and in the south. I can fairly say that I have, perhaps, come into closer contact with the Roman Catholic people of Ireland than any minister of my own church. And, with this experience, spreading over a period of thirty-eight years, I declare with all my heart, that I am ready to entrust my civil and religious liberty to the Irish people, with the fullest conviction that the trust will be safe in their keeping. The

agitation that has raged so vehemently of late is the old agitation that began seven centuries ago, when England first conquered Ireland. It is in no sense, with the Irish people, a religious agitation. The feeling was as strong when England and Ireland were both Catholic, as it has been since England became Protestant, only that the religious difference has added a special acrimony to the feeling. The men who are most hated in Ireland to-day, are Roman Catholics who have separated themselves from the national life, and have joined the English garrison. Lord Spencer truly stated at Leeds, that the trusted leaders of the Irish people since the Union have all been Protestants, with the exception of O'Connell. Those who tell us that Home Rule means Rome Rule do not know Ireland, or they have only studied on the surface the present national movement. It is a national movement pure and simple, except in Ulster, where Protestant prejudice has brought in the religious element."

MATTHEW KERR, Presbyterian Minister.

30, Patrick-street, Cork, 8th May, 1886.

I think the question in your's of 6th inst., is put most opportunely, and however much one may shrink from publicity, no Irishman would be true if he hesitated to express his opinion on the point, and his experience at such a crisis; therefore I reply with pleasure. My experience extends over a period of fifteen years active life in Cork, and during that time I have had most intimate personal, business, and social relations with Roman Catholics of all classes, and as a Protestant I have pride and pleasure in bearing testimony to their tolerance and large-mindedness—in fact a question of creed never has arisen within my knowledge, and I would have the greatest pleasure in doing all in my power to have Mr. Gladstone's measure passed, and have no fear whatever of my Catholic countrymen.

CRAWFORD LEDLIE, Draper.

[Of the firm of Robertson, Ledlie, Ferguson & Co., Cork ;
High Sheriff of Cork for 1887.]

Spa Hill House, Borris, Co. Carlow, 19th May, 1886.

Catholic intolerance ! I have often heard of it, but I have never seen a case of it. I have been living for the past fifteen years amidst my Catholic fellow-countrymen, and never during that time have I observed any one instance of illiberality amongst them. I am of opinion that my liberty, together with the free exercise of my religion, would stand intact under a native Government.

[SURGEON] JOHN GEORGE LITTLE, L.R.C.S.I.

The Grove Manse, Castleblaney, 11th May, 1886.

Gladly do I reply to your query thus :—I have lived for thirty-nine years among the Roman Catholics of County Monaghan, and can testify at any time or place that they have always treated me with the greatest respect and civility. The Roman Catholic priests, too, have been more gentlemanly and genial with me than the clergy of the now Disestablished Church. I have no dread of persecution, or any other form of injustice from the Roman Catholics, should Mr. Gladstone's noble and pacific Home Rule measure become law. And on the other hand I have often been rudely treated, once shot at, and occasionally boycotted by Orangemen. Publish these things I have said before England and the civilized world.

MATTHEW MACAULAY, Presbyterian Minister.

89 Merrion-square, Dublin, 8th May, 1886.

In answer to your question, I beg to say, I have not observed in Ireland intolerance among my Catholic friends and neighbours. I do not fear for my liberty or safety, neither do I think that in any part of the world I would be more free in the exercise of the religion to which I am attached, than I should be in Ireland under an Irish constitution such as is sketched out in the Bill to which you refer. I wish to say plainly that there are provisions in that Bill from which I strongly dissent ; but as regards intolerance or persecution on

the part of my Catholic fellow-countrymen, I have no fear whatever. It is, in my humble opinion, a groundless terror ; it is a hobgoblin fear conjured up by those Protestants only “whose conscience doth make cowards of themselves.”

ROBERT McDONNELL, M.D.

[Late President of the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland.]

Great Clonard, Wexford, 8th of Fifth-month, 1886.

During nearly thirty years residence in the midst of a Catholic population, I never saw the slightest sign of anything that would cause me any fear for the free exercise of my religion, or my liberty and safety. The disturbance that took place in Wexford about two and a half years since, during Major Whittle’s visit, was to my mind owing to a grudge the roughs had against the police, from whom they received some rough handling during a recent election. I don’t think the religious element had anything to do with it.

JOSEPH MACQUILLAN, Farmer.

Kilmorna, Co. Kerry, 15th May, 1886.

I have never known an instance in which religious intolerance has been shown by my Roman Catholic friends or neighbours ; on the contrary I can call to mind one or two very remarkable instances of liberality of feeling towards Protestants. I have not the slightest fear for my liberty or safety under an Irish constitution, nor do I think there would be the smallest danger that the free exercise of our religion would be interfered with in any way under an Irish Parliament. I have been frequently in Ireland since 1863, and have resided in the country since 1876, and since 1878 in North Kerry. I am a magistrate for the counties Limerick and Kerry.

PIERCE MAHONY.

[Late Sub-Commissioner under Land Act ; now M.P. for N. Meath.]

71 Patrick-street, Cork, 12th May, 1886.

I have no uneasiness whatever concerning Catholic intolerance ; having had frequent intercourse with Catholics in Dublin

between the years 1857 and 1863, and in Cork between the years 1869 and the present ; during the latter period my experience has been more valuable, and I have had business and social relations with Catholics during that time, which lead me to think that they are less exclusive than Protestants generally, and that Protestants ought to cultivate relations with them more than they do. In business our relations have been exceptionally satisfactory. I believe Catholics want no more than equality, and are growing fast in constitutional ideas which I fear Irish Protestants are not.

RUSSELL MARTIN.

[Town Councillor of Cork ; Town Commissioner for Queenstown.]

Tunduff, Abbeyleix, 17th May, 1886.

Replying to your query, I have never known or observed an instance of intolerance amongst my Roman Catholic friends and neighbours, nor do I possess any fear for my religious liberty and safety under the measure of Home Government proposed by Mr. Gladstone. I have been actively engaged as an agriculturist (and not altogether unknown tenant farmer) for forty years, and have had large experience in dealing with the rural class of my countrymen ; am myself a Presbyterian, and would, I dare say, be classed in the neighbourhood where I am best known as a strict Protestant.

JONATHAN MILLIE.

Ardanoir, Foynes, 10th May, 1886.

I have never known any authenticated instance of religious intolerance. On the other hand, I remember a Scripture reader in the parish of Ardagh, County Limerick, who used to show me the names of many Catholics as subscribers to his Protestant orphan card. Servants, Roman Catholic and Protestant, have agreed well to my knowledge. Catholics have said to me they like Protestant fellow-servants best. Personally having had a great deal to say to the Catholic clergy in connection with the emigration, I must say that with the

exception of yourself, Lord Monteagle, Mr. Parnell, and the late W. E. Forster, almost all the assistance, countenance, and support I received, apart from members of my own family, came from Catholics. I believe the Disestablishment of the Church did much, and that Home Rule will do more to lessen religious intolerance.

CHARLOTTE G. O'BRIEN.

Killiney, 14th May, 1886.

In reply to your inquiry, I willingly give you my experience. I have resided in different parts of Ireland during the last twenty years; my occupation has taken me into all parts of the country and has made me acquainted with all sorts and conditions of men. I have never experienced, observed, or heard of any intolerance on the part of Catholics towards Protestants. I know many instances of Protestants living isolated from those of their own creed in different parts of the country. Of late years I have made it a subject of inquiry whether such persons experienced any annoyance or ill-will on account of their religion. I have not met with any instance of such persons being molested or annoyed in any way on account of their religion. I know Protestants who have been elected as Poor Law Guardians by exclusively Catholic constituencies, in opposition to Catholic candidates, and of Protestants seeking appointments who have succeeded in obtaining them owing to the support and influence of Catholics. No tendency towards intolerance of Protestants is observable, and there is not in my opinion the slightest reason to anticipate anything of the kind under a Home Rule Government.

MURROUGH O'BRIEN.

Lyons Mills, Straffan, Co. Kildare, 22nd May, 1886.

I was born and brought up in Yorkshire, and have lived in Ireland for between ten and eleven years. During that time I have been employed in commercial pursuits, and have travelled either on business or for pleasure in twenty-eight out of

the thirty-two counties of Ireland. Since I came to this country I have come into contact, mostly in business, with far more Catholics than Protestants, and I cannot recollect having met with any instance of intolerance towards Protestants, because they were Protestants, on the part of Catholics. I see no reason for supposing that Protestants will be in any way interfered with in the exercise of their religion, or under any disadvantage because of it, when an Irish Parliament again comes into existence. It appears to me the theory that such will be the case, has only been put forward by those opponents of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, who have not better or more substantial arguments against it.

JOSEPH E. PALMER.

Passage West, Cork, 11th May, 1886.

I am in my seventy-first year, twenty-nine of which have been a good deal occupied in public life, principally as Poor Law Guardian of the Cork Union, the largest rural union in Ireland. I invariably found the Roman Catholic Guardians as interested in transacting the business of the Board as the Protestants. I live almost exclusively by the industry of my tenants, who are nearly all Catholics, with whom I have always been on the most friendly terms, and I see no reason whatsoever why giving us the power to make laws for our own better government should interfere in any way to disturb the good feeling which exists now, to prevent me and my fellow Protestants using the same freedom and exercise of our religious services as we have at present.

Wm. D'ESTERRE PARKER.

Narraghmore, Athy, 13th May, 1886.

In reply to your inquiry, I beg to explain that I am Scotchman and a Presbyterian, that I have lived as a farmer in Ireland for some forty years; that during that long period my residence has been among Roman Catholics in the counties

Kildare and Louth ; that I have invariably found my Roman Catholic neighbours kindly, friendly, hospitable, and most tolerant of my religious principles, and that judging from this experience the fear or the notion, as I think, foolishly entertained in some prejudiced and, let me say, benighted quarters, that if Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill became law, liberty and safety in the exercise of any form of the Protestant or Presbyterian religion would be interfered with by the Roman Catholic majority, is groundless and in my opinion ridiculous.

THOMAS ROBERTSON, Farmer.

Delgany, 20th May, 1886.

I am glad to be able to answer your communication to the following effect. I have never seen the slightest evidence that Protestants, as such, would have anything to fear from an independent Irish Legislature. I will add my belief, that as it was not by being kept under a glass-case that Protestantism became a power in the past, so assuredly it is not by cowardice and selfishness that it will remain so.

T. W. ROLLESTON.
[Editor *Dublin University Review*.]

South Mall, Cork, 8th May, 1886.

In reply to your query, I bear testimony with pleasure that during my lifetime of about fifty years, I have not known of any instances that would make me fear to live amongst my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, under the fullest measure of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill.

JOHN RUSSELL, Merchant.

90 South Mall, Cork, 10th May, 1886.

I am connected with Cork County for over forty years, and at business in Cork City and County nearly thirty years, and have not observed acts of intolerance from my Catholic neighbours, and I do not think my being a Protestant has in any

way interfered with my business relations with them, and they never in any way caused me fear for my religious liberty. I have no gloomy fears for the future, and under an Irish Parliament as marked out by Mr. Gladstone, fully believe there is no need of them.

JOHN H. RUTTER, Merchant and Manufacturer.

35 James's-street, Dublin, 15th May, 1886.

I have resided in Ireland all my life, now fifty-eight years. I resided for forty years in the County Kildare, engaged in mercantile and agricultural pursuits. I have since resided in or near Dublin, and have been actively engaged in business as well as in public life, as a Poor-law Guardian, Town Councillor, and Justice of the Peace—having thus had large intercourse with my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, both lay and clerical. I have no fears or anticipations that under the proposed Irish constitution my civil and religious liberties will be interfered with. Every one meets with intolerance at times. My experiences of it have more often been evinced by Protestants than by Catholics.

ABRAHAM SHACKLETON, J.P.

[Poor-law Guardian ; Senior partner, George Shackleton & Sons, Millers, etc.]

Glassdrummond, Saintfield, 24th May, 1886.

As an Ulster Presbyterian farmer, residing here all my life, I have never either heard of, observed, or experienced a single instance of intolerance amongst my Catholic fellow-countrymen towards Presbyterians or Protestants, such as would lead me to fear for my liberty or safety, or the exercise of my religion, under an Irish constitution such as Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill. The propagation of idle and unworthy fears in respect of the above measure becoming law, is the work of the enemy, who know very well that if Catholics and Presbyterians join in social and political unity, landlord oppression and tyranny is at an end. People here are expressing no fears whatever.

FRANCIS SHEPHERD, Farmer.

Ravarnett, near Lisburn, 21st of Fifth-month, 1886.

I have never experienced personally any intolerance on the part of any of my fellow-countrymen, except on one occasion, and that my Roman Catholic countrymen had no part in. I have never observed any intolerance on the part of Catholics towards Protestants in consequence of their being Protestants. I have lived in Ireland all my time—now just half a century—six years in two large commercial concerns in the city of Dublin, eight as working manager of the weaving department of one of the largest linen-manufacturing concerns in the world (near Newry), eight as managing partner in a linen manufacturing concern near Tandragee (Co. Armagh), my native place, ten as linen manufacturer and farmer in Co. Down. For the past twenty to thirty years (I might say all my life) I have taken a deep interest in everything that concerns the welfare of my native land and its people. After much careful and prayerful thought, some reading, and some experience, I have come to the conclusion that my religious opinions as a member of the Society of Friends, and one who believes in its peace principles and all its principles, would have no cause to fear for its safety and liberty under an Irish Constitution, similar in most respects to that sketched out by the Premier. I believe it would tend to draw us into closer friendship with England, her people, and her interests, and that Ireland would be more loyal to the Queen than she has been in the past; and if all parties would sink religious and political differences, and turn their attention, as reasonable men, to what would be for the real good of our common country, that at no very distant date we would have comparatively a loyal, peaceable, prosperous, and contented Ireland. As a business man and linen manufacturer, I could not agree to our not having a fair representation in the Imperial Parliament. We have, in common with other parts of Great Britain, commercial treaties and other Imperial matters in which I think Ireland is fairly entitled to have her say. Ireland and

Irishmen have in the past acted a very important part in assisting to build up England's greatness, and with a blessing will in the future continue to assist in maintaining it.

JOHN SINTON, Manufacturer.

Court Devenish, Athlone, 10th May, 1886,

I have lived for eight years in the most Catholic part of Munster, and some thirty-five in Leinster, and have travelled extensively through all Ireland. I have met with no instance of intolerance exercised against Protestants because of their religion. For my own part I have no fears of anything of this sort, and I have met with very few in the South and West who have. Those who express such fears generally I find show themselves of an intolerant spirit. I would strenuously urge my Northern fellow-countrymen to cast away such unworthy fears, and, taking example from their Southern fellow-Protestants, whom they profess to regard as lambs in the midst of wolves, show their faith in God, and try the effect of the golden rule by doing unto Catholics as they would they should do unto them. My conviction is that if those who should be foremost in spreading the message of peace and good-will among men, will only stand aside and let the people fraternize, there will not be the slightest danger of religious persecution.

Wm. SMITH, Woollen Manufacturer.

North Main-street, Bandon, 12th May, 1886.

Since I went to my first curacy, more than thirty-three years ago, I have been residing in the County Cork. Neither my own observation nor anything communicated by parishioners has given me reason to believe in the existence of hostile feelings towards us on the part of Roman Catholics. On the contrary, I can testify that friendly relations very largely exist, and that it is a matter of daily occurrence to find the poorer classes of Roman Catholics and Protestants rendering such neighbourly offices to one another as may be in their power. Unfortunately I know many Protestants who take a

very different view from mine ; but they seem to me to build more upon theory and preconceived opinion than upon facts of which they have cognizance, and they are often inconsistent enough to be on excellent terms with their Roman Catholic neighbours notwithstanding.

J. STEVENSON, late Rector of Brinny.

49 Mountjoy-square, South, Dublin, 19th May, 1886.

In answer to your inquiry on the subject, I beg to state that I have never met with intolerance of any sort from my Catholic fellow-countrymen, and when I tell you, as is the fact, many of my intimate friends, and the majority of my clients, are Catholic, I think I have said enough on the subject. Although hitherto opposed to Home Rule, I am now in favour of the scheme as proposed by Mr. Gladstone. I think he is honestly doing his best to settle the question. In my opinion there is an increase of favourable opinion as regards Home Rule amongst persons of my persuasion in Dublin. I know of several churches in the city at the Easter Vestries, at which the resolution against Home Rule was not put. If Home Rule is to be the law, I for one will submit myself into the hands of my fellow-countrymen, with every confidence that things will go right, and perhaps like the old woman who went over the equator in fear and trembling, we won't feel the jolt at all.

JOHN T. TATLOW, Solicitor.

4 Addison Gardens, Kensington,
London, W., 8th May, 1886.

In answer to your queries, I have much pleasure in telling you that I have not the least fear that when our Parliament is restored the liberty or safety of any peaceable Protestant in Ireland will be in danger. I have resided in different parts of Ireland, sometimes for many months at a time, sometimes only for a few weeks, during most years since 1862. I be-

long to the Protestant Church, and my Catholic fellow-countrymen and women have never given me reason to believe that the free exercise of my religion would be interfered with by them "under," to quote your words, "an Irish constitution such as that sketched out in Mr. Gladstone's Bill." I am joint owner of some landed property in Ireland. Amongst our tenants (numbering over fifty) there is one Protestant family, and they are on the best of terms with their Catholic neighbours. They have often told me so. I may also mention that wishing some time ago to establish a free lending library in our valley, I was a little doubtful if the Catholic Priest would approve of a Protestant buying books for his flock. Hearing this, the rev. gentleman most kindly wrote to say that he had perfect confidence in the choice I might make, and would only venture to suggest that some of Sir Walter Scott's best works, and some of Charles Dickens' might be amongst those selected. I need hardly add that I followed this advice. If you think that my experience in this matter may be useful in the cause of peace, you are at perfect liberty to publish my name, though it is not a well known one, for I generally write under a *nom de plume*.

EMILY SKEFFINGTON THOMPSON.

Maryborough, 12th May, 1886.

In reply to yours of the 6th May, I believe the best answer would be to enclose copy of letter sent *Freeman*, and published last January, in reference to the high-handed proceeding taken by Committee of Privileges. I would reiterate the statement made then, and feel satisfied that with the Government in the hands of the Irish people, Protestantism will have nothing to fear. Just as the Disestablishment of the Church gave an impulse to its members to rise above their serfdom and from under the upper ten, so would Protestants be free to throw aside their narrow bigotry and jealousies, and work for the

common good and weal of old Ireland ; then even the most timid would have nothing to fear. Since 1860 I have been amongst my Catholic friends, and never have I observed any instances of intolerance on their part, unless where it was brought on by over-zealous Protestants in their zeal for the conversion of their Catholic friends.

GEORGE VANSTON,
Poor Rate Collector and Town Clerk.

[*Extracts from letter above referred to.*]

I have lived for the past forty years amongst a Catholic community, and so far from having received any slight on account of my religious convictions, I have been always treated with friendship and esteem ; so much so that on two occasions on which I allowed my name to be put in nomination for two important positions, which were entirely in the gift of my Catholic friends, I was elected by large majorities over my Catholic competitors. It is simply absurd on the part of educated Protestants to fear any injustice or harm would result to them on account of their religious opinions when we have our Parliament in College-green. Such a cry would or could only be raised from the landlord class that are anxious to retain the feudal privileges which our nineteenth century civilization has condemned.

Leamington, 10th May, 1886.

You have invited me to state whether my experience of Irish Catholics would lead me to apprehend danger to the religious freedom of Irish Protestants from Home Rule in Ireland ? I have never resided in Ireland, but I have made a special study of Ireland's unhappy history, and I have had a very considerable acquaintance with Irish Catholics and Protestants for fifty years. In reply to your inquiry, I give it as my conviction that Protestantism has no reasonable ground of apprehension from an Irish Government elected by the Irish people. No church establishment, and no religious persecution, will be allowed in Ireland by the British people.

Ulster is frightened by a bad conscience. She remembers how she always supported the abominable Penal Laws against Catholics, and gave support (though she hated episcopacy) to that upas tree of Ireland—the Elizabethan Church. The Irish Catholics would now gladly forget these past wrongs, and receive Ulster into the sisterhood of the nation. Let Ulster be wise in time, and she has nothing to fear. Her best friends will advise Ulster, and the Protestants of Ireland elsewhere, to become national in their feelings and desires ; they will then assuredly have full freedom, and all the influence they can fairly expect.

JOHN THOMAS WALTERS, M.A.

[Rector of Norton ; Author of *Ireland's Wrongs and How to Mend Them.*]

Glenageary, Co. Dublin, 14th May, 1886.

Having always lived in Dublin, and having been engaged in commercial pursuits, and to some small extent in public movements, I have come a good deal into contact with my Catholic fellow-countrymen. I belong to the most Protestant of the Protestant religious bodies—the Society of Friends—and have no hesitation in saying that I believe, under a constitution such as Mr. Gladstone's Bill would give to Ireland, the civil and religious liberty of every individual would be as secure as in any other country. I believe a love of domination over others is not a characteristic of Irishmen, and that the natural good sense and good feeling of our own people would tend to obtain freedom for all. Also, that free representative institutions, such as the Bill seeks to establish, would prove as inimical to the growth of religious intolerance or ascendancy in Ireland, as they always have done elsewhere.

THOMAS HENRY WEBB.

[Director of J. H. Webb & Co., Limited, The Advertising Co., etc.]

The Deanery, Berkeley Hall, Cork, 13th May, 1886.

I don't suppose that any wise man believes that persecution will ever disappear from Christendom, until all Christians feel

what Our Lord meant by the words “ My Kingdom is not of this world.” As far as I am concerned, I have been twenty-nine years in Cork, and I have met my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects here in all the public and in many of the private relations of life. I have never experienced anything from them other than the treatment of tolerant Christian gentlemen; and I have no hesitation in expressing my belief that Mr. Gladstone’s Bill will tend to sweeten the relations of all classes in Ireland. Of course if men will be fanatics, whether they be Protestants or Roman Catholics, we cannot help them, so we must bear their intolerance as well as we can.

GEORGE WEBSTER, D.D., Chancellor of Cork, etc.

Killiney, Co. Dublin, 13th of Fifth-month, 1886.

In reply to your inquiry I have to say, that during a residence of nearly thirty years in Ireland, I have come a good deal in contact in various ways with my Catholic fellow-subjects, and there is nothing in this experience to “lead me to fear for my liberty and safety, and for the free exercise of my religion under an Irish constitution, such as that sketched out in Mr. Gladstone’s Bill.”

HENRY WIGHAM, Merchant.

Dublin, 17th May, 1886.

As an Englishman and Protestant residing in Ireland near thirty years, I must say that I have not observed any indication that would lead me to believe that my Catholic friends and neighbours would interfere either with my liberty or religion. I have always received the greatest kindness and support from the Catholics of Ireland, amongst whom are some of my best friends: as an instance I may say, that I have been twice unanimously elected as Town Councillor for my ward, perhaps the most pronouncedly Catholic of the city. Certainly

under an Irish constitution such as proposed by Mr. Gladstone, I would have no hesitation in having the fullest confidence in the citizens of my adopted country.

JAMES WINSTANLEY.

[Manufacturer ; Alderman in the Dublin Corporation.]

Montenotte, Cork, 7th May, 1886.

I have lived in Ireland nearly all my life, and for the last few years have had many opportunities at public meetings, etc., of observing the feeling in the south of Ireland, as between Protestant and Catholic. On the Catholic side I have not seen a trace of intolerance such as would bespeak a spirit of retaliation. But, on the contrary, I have repeatedly observed the enthusiasm with which any overture on the part of a Protestant to join heartily with Catholics for the common good of their country, has been received. I believe the idea that under Home Rule we, the Protestants, would receive less than justice, is the idlest phantom of a guilty conscience.

EDWARD A. WRIGHT.

[Barrington Lecturer on Political Economy ; Member of the firm of Wright and Sons, Grocers and Jam Manufacturers, Cork.]

Avonmore, Derryvolgie, Belfast, 21st May, 1886.

I was born and spent my early years in the midst of a Catholic people, in a thickly populated townland in the County of Down, and since have associated with the best Catholic families in Belfast for over forty years, and as an employer of labour have had large experience of Catholic employes in places of power and trust, and can truly testify that for honesty, fidelity, *forbearance under provocation*—in a word, for high moral worth, the Catholic people of all ranks compare favourably with the numerous members of other denominations among whom in Belfast they live. It would be a positive insult to say that on account of creed the highest legislative responsibilities should be withheld from the Catholic people.

SAMUEL YOUNG.

Irish Protestant Home Rule Association.

A D D R E S S TO THE PROTESTANTS OF IRELAND.

PROTESTANT FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN,

At the present crisis, when the political energies and thought of the people of these countries are concentrated upon the practical solution of the great problem of the Better Government of Ireland, this Association has been formed in order to unite all classes and denominations of Protestants in promoting a safe, equitable, and permanent settlement of the question.

It is not our desire to separate ourselves from our Roman Catholic countrymen. But we ask for your co-operation and support in order to counteract the gross misrepresentations which allege that the Protestants of Ireland are unanimously opposed to the Irish policy of Mr. Gladstone.

Attempts have been made to create in the minds of our fellow-citizens in England and Scotland, groundless apprehensions of dangers to us of religious persecution, or of the impositions of civil disabilities, and by appeals to religious bigotry and party rancour to excite in our minds a bitter hatred and distrust of our own countrymen. But as Protestants who have hitherto preserved our civil and religious liberties as a sacred treasure, and who are to-day equally resolved and prepared to defend their rights, we reject with scorn the calumny that the lives and liberties of Protestant Irishmen would be imperilled by the restoration of an Irish Parliament.

The foremost statesman of the century, aided by his loyal associates in the Cabinet, and supported by the great English and Scotch Liberal Party, the true Representatives of the People, has undertaken the task of creating a responsible Irish Government. He seeks to remove Irish local affairs from the arena of English party strife. He proposes to commit them to the control of our freely elected representatives in an Irish Legislature, so as to enable us to re-establish social order in Ireland, and, by the enactment and equitable administration of just laws adapted to our local wants, to provide free scope for the advancement

of the agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial industries of our country.

Against this great statesman are marshalled the combined forces of those territorial and class interests, whose influence in maintaining social conditions, which have tended to raise rents and reduce wages, has perpetuated pauperism and crime, driven away capital, discouraged manufactures, and disorganized commerce.

Fellow Protestants, our interests are bound up with those of our native land.

Let us unite with our fellow-countrymen in a spirit of tolerance and trust. Let us work together for the common good of this fair land, and bring to bear upon the great work with which we are to be entrusted, the united intelligence, knowledge, and skill of our whole people.

We are aware, by communications from many quarters, that efforts have been made by means of threats of social ostracism, business losses, and of other penalties, to deter Irish Protestants who are favourable to Irish Self-Government from publicly declaring their opinions at this crisis. Nevertheless, we earnestly appeal to them to boldly take that position in the popular movement, of which we are confident the verdict of posterity will approve.

The vital importance of an immediate settlement of this great question, the necessity for the removal of that political strain which at once paralyzes the Imperial Legislature, and constitutes a constant menace to social order in Ireland, urges us to call upon all Irish Protestants for a united effort to close the dreary chapter of our country's mis-government, and render possible a new era of peace, contentment, and prosperity.

THOMAS SHILLINGTON, Jun., Portadown,	President.
W. J. SMYTH, General, Royal Artillery, F.R.S.,	Vice-Presidents.
M.R.I.A., Carmoney, Co. Antrim,	
ALEXANDER W. SHAW, J.P., Limerick,	
ALFRED WEBB, Dublin,	
W. D'ESTERRE PARKER, P.L.G., Cork,	
EDMUND HARVEY, Grange, Co. Waterford,	
THOMAS McCLELLAND, J.P. Belfast,	Hon. Secretaries, Central Executive.
DAVID BRIGGS,	
JAMES J. JOHNSTON,	
WILLIAM HAMMOND,	
CHARLES HUBERT OLDHAM, Hon. Local Secretary, Dublin.	Hon. Local Secretary, Cork.
RUSSELL MARTIN, Hon. Local Secretary, Cork.	

Belfast, 23rd June, 1886.

Offices for Dublin and South and West of Ireland : 116 Grafton-street,
Dublin.

The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) **Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill.** By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) **The Orange Bogey.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) **The Chicago Convention.** By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P.
- (4) **The Irish Land Crisis.**
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P
- (5) **The "Castle" System.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (6) **The Truth about '98.** By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P.
- (7) **Irish Industries and English Legislation.**
By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (8) **The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.**
By CHARLES DAWSON, EX-M.P.
- (9) **An Irish Judge on the Irish Question.**
With Introduction by J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (10) **Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.**
By ALFRED WEBB.
Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P
- The Elections of 1885.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- Coercion.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

Price One Penny each.

A Word for Ireland. By T. M. HEALY, B.L. Price 1s.

Report on the Present State of the Irish Land Question.
By A LAND VALUER. Price 6d.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.



Other Tracts in preparation.

The Irish Question.

IRISH PROTESTANTS AND HOME RULE :

*A LECTURE DELIVERED IN THE ROTUNDA, DUBLIN,
29th November, 1886,*

The Right Hon. the Lord Mayor, M.P., in the Chair.

BY
J. E. REDMOND, M.P.
Barrister-at-Law.

LONDON :
THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1887
Price One Penny.

IRISH PROTESTANTS AND HOME RULE.

INTRODUCTORY.

IN choosing a subject for my lecture to-night, I have been guided by a consideration which ought, I think, to be present to the mind of everyone who properly appreciates the position in which the National cause is placed at this moment. That cause which in the time of our own fathers appeared to be a losing one, associated as it was with memories of almost unbroken disaster and defeat, has suddenly experienced that turn of fortune which is ever in store for a cause founded upon truth. We have seen the cause of Irish liberty advanced in our day to the very threshold of victory. We have seen our friends multiplying and our enemies disappearing ; we have seen the heart of the civilized world touched by the spectacle of Ireland's constancy and devotion, and minds and ears that were long closed by prejudice and ignorance against the demands of Ireland are now open to the voice of reason. Up to the present it has been a blind struggle of might against right. Force and not reason has been the guiding principle in the government of our country ; but to-day England, if she has not conceded our demand, has at any rate laid aside the sword, and consented to listen to argument. When once, to a cause founded upon right, the test of argument is thus applied, the triumph of justice is assured. The last elections in Great Britain disclosed Wales and Scotland in agreement with Ireland, and disclosed England not so much hostile as perplexed, hesitating, and doubtful. She was willing to listen and to learn, but she knew not whom to trust or whose story to believe. Her doubts and perplexities alone stand between us and the final triumph of our cause to-day. These

doubts and perplexities are, in my opinion, for the most part, sincere and honest ; and the one great duty of the moment for Irish Nationalists is to explain them away or to satisfy them.

In fulfilment of this duty I have selected my subject for to-night, and instead of speaking simply as a Nationalist to an audience of Nationalists, I prefer to address myself to the task of grappling with one of those difficulties which many Englishmen do honestly see in the way of a concession of Home Rule to Ireland.

THE CHARGE OF RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE.

The charge made against the mass of the Irish people of religious intolerance, is perhaps the most insulting accusation which could be levelled against a nation struggling to be free, and if proved would go far, indeed, to justify the refusal of free institutions to a people who themselves had not conceived the fundamental ideas of freedom. Such a charge against any nation at this time of the nineteenth century to ordinary persons would seem a little exaggerated ; but coming from the people of England against the people of Ireland, such a charge must seem to anyone who knows the facts, and has read the pages of history, little short of absurd and ridiculous. Still this accusation was freely made against our people during the last elections. The English people were told by statesmen, who well know the contrary to be the truth, that it would not be safe to give Home Rule to Ireland, because Ireland was made up not of one nation but of two, and that the Protestant Irish nation being in the minority would suffer persecution and injustice at the hands of a National Parliament in Dublin containing a majority of Catholics. Absurd as this accusation is, there is reason to believe that it had considerable weight with many Englishmen, and it undoubtedly constitutes one of the difficulties which still stand in the way of the concession of self-government to Ireland. It consequently becomes our duty to expose its fallacy, to show its inherent impossibility, and to appeal to the pages of history in support of our argument.

THE "Two NATIONS" ARGUMENT.

I propose shortly to prove—first, that there are no two nations in Ireland to-day, and secondly, that all the history of the past disproves the assertion that Catholic Irishmen ever were guilty of religious persecution, and all the experience of the present shows them to be incapable either of intolerance or bigotry. I assert that there are no two nations in Ireland to-day—that all the people of this land—Catholic, and Protestant, and Presbyterian—of Celtic, or Norman, or Saxon extraction—are all children of one nation, bound together not only by common interests, but by common traditions, memories, and history. In order to prove my assertion, it is necessary briefly to glance at the history of Protestant patriotism in Ireland, and to show how the English Protestant colony became in fact and in substance incorporated with the native Irish, as the Normans had been incorporated with them before, and how what was established as an English garrison, in the end became converted into the garrison of the national rights and liberties of Ireland. In tracing this story I will at one and the same time show how much Ireland owes to her Protestant patriots, and how strong are the bonds which unite into one nation Irishmen of every religious persuasion. At one time it could truly be said that there were two nations in Ireland, if indeed the native Catholic masses could be said to exist at all after the violation of the Treaty of Limerick, and the departure of Sarsfield and the Irish soldiery to France ; and if the narrow, self-seeking, and intolerant Protestant faction which monopolized all power and privilege, deserved to be dignified by the name of a nation. From 1691, for nearly one hundred years, the native Catholic masses as a nation may be said almost to have disappeared. They were penalized and outlawed. They were banished from Parliament and deprived of the franchise ; they could not possess property, or practise their religion, or educate their children. Their leaders were in exile, fighting under the standards of foreign monarchs, and those at

home in Ireland beaten to the ground were hopeless and helpless. What went by the name of “the Irish nation” was the colony of English Protestants who had undertaken the government of the country, who had become possessed of the lands of the Catholics, and who were so divided from the masses of the people by religion and sentiment that they seemed to think their only safety lay in forging penal chains for the native Irish. At that time indeed there were two nations in Ireland ; but I think no history in the world affords a parallel to the extraordinary result which speedily followed.

These two nations coalesced, not by the weak persecuted native nation bowing to the stronger English colony, but by the awakening in the hearts of the English colony of a spirit of Irish nationality and patriotism, which speedily fused into one nation struggling for its rights, Catholic and Protestant, English colonist and native Irish. The manner in which this happy consummation was brought about was characteristic of the treatment which Ireland had ever received from the government of England.

OPPRESSION OF THE PROTESTANT COLONY BY ENGLAND.

The Protestant colony was expected by England to enslave the Irish nation; but having done so, it was expected also to submit to slavery itself. “Your ancestors,” said John Philpot Curran to the Irish Parliament a hundred years afterwards—“your ancestors thought themselves the oppressors of their fellow-countrymen, but they were only their jailors ; and the justice of Providence would have been frustrated if their own slavery had not been the punishment of their vice and folly.” The Protestant colony had succeeded in completely suppressing the native Irish. It had absolutely excluded the Catholics from power. It had made the executive of the country exclusively Protestant ; but when it aspired to freedom for itself, it was speedily taught that it was nothing more than the agent of England, and that the only freedom it could claim was the free-

dom to oppress and trample on the ancient Irish nation. In point of fact, as soon as the colony had succeeded in enslaving the Irish, England set to work to enslave the colony. The colony had deprived the Catholics of a share in Parliament. England thereupon robbed the Parliament of its independence. The colony had condemned the Catholics to poverty, England thereupon restricted the trade and destroyed the prosperity of the colony.

The claim of the English Parliament to control, direct, and bind the Irish legislature was of old origin. Poyning's Law, which enacted that no bill could be originated in the Irish Parliament until the heads of it had been sanctioned by the English Privy Council, was, it is true, passed so early as 1495. But repeatedly the Irish Parliament had endeavoured with more or less success to free itself from the fetter. In 1640 it asserted its right to legislative independence. Later on, the Confederation of Kilkenny asserted the same right in a still more unequivocal manner. In 1689 the so-called Catholic Parliament of James II. repealed Poyning's Act, and again asserted the legislative independence of Ireland. But after the triumph of William III. the Irish legislature definitely sank to the level of a committee of the English Parliament, and the more the colonists suppressed the liberties of the Catholics, the more England suppressed their own privileges and degraded their own Parliament. In 1699 a fatal blow was struck by England at the commercial prosperity of the colony. The woollen trade was practically suppressed. All exports of woollen cloths were prohibited except to England and Wales, and even this exception was delusive, for heavy duties, amounting to a prohibition, prevented Irish cloth being imported into England or Wales. All trade between Ireland and the colonies was prohibited by the Navigation Laws. Mr. Lecky says in his *History of the Eighteenth Century* :—

“ Protestants then began to find that they were as little thought of as the Catholics. The suppression of the woollen trade brought ruin upon

12,000 Protestant families in Dublin, and 30,000 in the rest of the country. By her commercial laws England deliberately crushed the prosperity of the Protestant colony of Ireland, drove thousands of them into exile, arrested the influx of Protestant population from Great Britain, and inspired the Presbyterians of the north with a bitter hatred of her rule."

THE BIRTH OF PROTESTANT PATRIOTISM.

In point of fact a deliberate system was established to put down alike the political pretensions and the commercial prosperity of the Protestants of Ireland, who then found themselves in this extraordinary situation. They had practically conquered Ireland and enslaved the Irish people, and in return they were expected to calmly accept the position of slaves for themselves. Then there was born in the breasts of those men the first spark of that sentiment of nationality which was destined to win for them and their country commercial freedom and legislative independence, and eventually to weld into one nation Irishmen of all creeds and of all bloods. This spirit at first was very timid, very narrow-minded, and selfish. It never seemed to occur to these men that to constitute a nation, and to assert its independence, the concession of liberty to all Irishmen was essential.

MOLYNEUX.

At first their ideas of nationality included only the Protestants of Ireland. We shall see by and by how this idea, fructified and developed, until, in the minds of Grattan and his colleagues, the Irish nation for which they had struggled included their countrymen of every creed. The first evidence of this growing spirit of revolt against English oppression was furnished by the publication of the celebrated *Case of Ireland Stated*, which was a book written by Mr. William Molyneux, member for Dublin University, in which he conclusively proved that England had no legal or equitable right to interfere in the legislation of the Irish Parliament. It was, in truth, as a voice crying in the wilderness. Men were amazed at its audacity, and English statesmen were horrified at what they called its revolutionary doctrines. The

book was burned by order of the English Parliament by the hands of the common hangman, but the spirit of which it was an evidence survived, and from that day forward the patriot party amongst the Protestants of Ireland may be said to have existed.

SWIFT.

It was at this period of Ireland's history, when the idea of nationality was slowly developing in the minds of the Protestant colony, that there appeared upon the political stage the striking and eccentric figure of Jonathan Swift, Dean of St. Patrick's. Swift was one of the strangest characters in Irish history—an odd mixture of patriotism and narrow bigotry, of genius and eccentricity. He never made the slightest effort to mitigate the persecution of the Catholics; he never for an instant included them in his idea of Irish Nationality; yet he did as much, probably, as any man in history to lift Ireland into the position of a nation; and he not only paved the way for, but he rendered absolutely inevitable, that fusion between the Protestant colony and the native Catholics, which, in the end, won independence for the country. He urged the people to meet the restrictions placed upon their trade by boycotting foreign goods, and advised them to "burn everything English except their coals." He seized upon the question of supplying Ireland with a new copper coinage, as an opportunity for vindicating the independence of the country, and in the *Drapier Letters* he boldly asserted the ideas which were rapidly maturing in the minds of the Protestants. He asserted the legislative independence of Ireland, and the nullity of those measures which had not received the sanction of the Irish Legislature. He avowed his entire adherence to the doctrine of Molyneux; he asserted that Ireland was rightfully a free nation, which implied a right of self-government, "for government without the consent of the governed was the very definition of slavery." In vain England sought to insist upon Wood's halfpence. Swift, in fighting this issue, was fighting the battle of Irish independence. He

persevered ; he united the people of all creeds at his back, and in the end he carried his point. Speaking of this contest, Mr. Lecky says :—

“This contest deserves to be placed in the foremost ranks in the annals of the Irish race. There is no more momentous epoch in the history of a nation, than that in which the voice of a people has first spoken, and spoken with success. It marks the transition from an age of semi-barbarism to an age of civilization, from the government of force to the government of opinion. Before this time rebellion was the natural issue of every patriotic effort in Ireland ; since then rebellion has been an anachronism and a mistake. The age of Desmond and O’Neill had passed ; the age of Grattan and O’Connell had begun.”

Swift now became the idol and leader of the Irish people. He taught them their first lessons in self-reliance. He led them to victory when oppression had well nigh broken their spirit, and when the exile of all their own leaders had robbed them of hope ; he held up before their eyes the possibility—soon afterwards to be in part realized—of a fusion of the two sections into one nation ; and consequently, in spite of his well-known intolerance and bigotry, he became the most universally popular man in Ireland. His ending was singularly tragic. The great controversialist, the energetic patriot, the brilliant wit, sank into his grave in a hopeless state of idiocy.

“Last scene of all,
That ends this strange, eventful history
Is second childishness and mere oblivion.”

Swift passed away, but the cause of Irish Nationality which he had championed never afterwards passed away from the minds either of the Protestants or the Catholics of Ireland.

THE VOLUNTEERS.

Flood then stepped into the position of leader of the Patriot Party, and at one step we may pass on to the history of the Volunteers. In 1778 the Irish Parliament sanctioned the enrolment of a volunteer force for the defence of the country. Mr. Lecky thus describes what then occurred. He says :—

“Then arose one of those movements of enthusiasm that occur two or three times in the history of a nation. The cry to arms passed through the land, and was speedily responded to by all parties and by all creeds. Beginning with the Protestants of the North, the movement soon spread to other parts of the island, and the war of religions and of creeds, that had so long divided the people, vanished as a dream. The inertness produced by centuries of oppression was speedily forgotten, and replaced by the consciousness of recovered strength. From Howth to Connemara, from the Giant’s Causeway to Cape Clear, the enthusiasm had passed and the creation of an army had begun.”

The Irish Volunteers were at first an exclusively Protestant organization, but so anxious were the Catholics from the first to participate in the movement, that in the City of Limerick, when forbidden to bear arms themselves they subscribed £800 to purchase arms for their Protestant fellow-countrymen. It was a happy omen of the fusion of the two nations which was about to take place. It was now that public spirit in Ireland began at last to be truly National. Henry Grattan saw in the Volunteers a means of uniting Irishmen, and owing largely to his exertions, Catholics were at last admitted into the ranks of the national army. *From that day forward the two nations had ceased to exist.* Shoulder to shoulder, Catholic and Protestant Irishmen united to demand free trade and a free parliament. In the words of Flood:—“A voice from America shouted ‘liberty,’ and every hill and valley of this rejoicing land answered ‘liberty !’” In 1780 the Volunteers obtained for this country a first instalment of liberty in the concession of complete free trade—that is, the freedom of their trade from all restrictions placed upon it by any authority other than the legislature of Ireland. The next step was the assertion of the independence of the Irish Parliament from interference by England. Day by day the fusion of the two nations was becoming more perfect; day by day the fell spirit of sectarian hate was dying out. The Volunteers declared at Dungannon, in Convention assembled, that:—

“We hold the right of private judgment in matters of religion to be equally sacred in others as in ourselves, and we conceive the measure of

relaxation of the Penal Laws against the Roman Catholics to be fraught with the happiest consequences of the Union and prosperity of the inhabitants of Ireland.”

And Grattan repeatedly voiced the determination of the leaders of the patriot party to base Irish liberty upon the recognition of the entire people. In one of his speeches he made this remarkable declaration :—

“So long as the Penal Code remains we can never be a great nation. . . , I would not keep two millions of my fellow-countrymen in a state of slavery. I desire not a Protestant settlement, but an Irish nation.”

EMANCIPATING THE CATHOLICS.

How Legislative Independence was won in 1782 every one knows, and how the Protestant Parliament, having broken its own fetters, set itself instantly to the task of admitting Catholics to their full rights will never be forgotten. The work of emancipation was slow, but sure. In 1793 Catholics were admitted to the franchise, the juries, the professions, and the universities ; and when two years later Lord Fitzwilliam arrived in Ireland, we have that nobleman’s own authority for the statement, “that the Protestants of Ireland had generally accepted and approved of a policy of complete and immediate emancipation.”

THE UNION.

Unfortunately, English statesmen had at this time determined to force a scheme of legislative union upon the country, and they knew that such a policy would be impossible if once the Catholics were admitted within the constitution. Primate Boulter, more than half a century before, had said, “When Papist and Protestant unite, good-bye to the English interest in Ireland.” English ministers determined this union should not take place. Accordingly, the policy of emancipation was wrecked, and an intolerant Irish faction was utilized for the purpose of stirring up religious animosities and driving the people into insurrection. The

diabolical plan succeeded only too well, and Ireland was robbed of her Parliament.

But neither then nor since has England ever been able to divide Ireland again into two nations. Protestants won the Parliament of '82 ; Protestants organized the society of United Irishmen, and filled its ranks both before and after it became a revolutionary body ; Protestants gave the franchise to Catholics in 1793 ; Protestants led the rebel armies in 1798 ; Protestants gallantly, but vainly, defended Irish constitutional liberty in 1800 ; and from that day to the present no movement has ever been started, either on behalf of national independence or religious freedom, which Protestant Irishmen have not shared in or led.

THE ANTI-IRISH FACTION.

It is true that all this time there had been an intolerant anti-Irish and anti-Catholic faction in Ireland. The men who in 1793 opposed the claims of the Catholics, who brought about the recall of Fitzwilliam in 1795, whose bigotry and fanatical oppression drove the people into arms in '98, who posed as the English garrison in 1800, and sold their country's liberty, and who from that day to this hour have ever been the despised tools of English misgovernment in Ireland—these men no one can seriously say constitute a nation. They have never risen above the tactics or the aspirations of a faction. The only nation in Ireland to-day is the one nation of Irishmen, bound together by devotion to the land that bore them, by hatred of oppression and love of liberty, and by the memory of the scenes when their fore-fathers, Catholics and Protestants alike, shed their blood in defence of religious toleration, and national freedom.

This, then, is our answer to the statement that there are two nations in Ireland to-day. The history of the past and the realities of the present alike protest against it as an absurdity and an affront.

THE FEAR OF PERSECUTION UNDER HOME RULE.

More difficult is it adequately to reply to the second part of the accusation, which is in the nature of a prophecy, that under a Home Rule Parliament the Catholic majority would persecute and oppress their Protestant fellow-countrymen. Grattan once said :—" You cannot argue with a prophet, you can only disbelieve him." In the case of this evil prophecy we can in addition apply it to the test of experience and history.

When and where and how have Catholic Irishmen evinced a spirit of religious persecution and intolerance ? If it be possible to show, as I contend that it is, that Irish Catholics are almost the only people in the world's history who have never persecuted for conscience sake, that when they had the supremacy in the past they never oppressed their Protestant fellow-countrymen, and that in matters in which they hold power to-day they make no distinction between men of different creeds—if it is possible to prove all this, what becomes of the evil prophecy of our enemies ? There are four distinct times in the history of Ireland when the Catholics possessed supremacy and had the power to persecute and oppress their Protestant fellow-countrymen. These periods were (1) in the reign of Queen Mary ; (2) in 1641 ; (3) at the time of the Catholic Parliament of 1689 ; and (4) at the present time, when Catholics have sufficient power in the commercial, social, and municipal life of Ireland to make a man's creed a disability to him if the spirit of religious intolerance were abroad. Let me briefly deal with these four periods.

FIRST PERIOD OF CATHOLIC POWER—IN THE REIGN OF MARY.

In the reign of Mary the Catholics were suddenly restored from persecution to power. They were fresh from oppression, for conscience sake, of the most horrible character. In England the change from persecution to power was marked by oppression of the Protestants by the Catholics. Mary burned to death her

Protestant subjects; but the Irish Catholics did not persecute a single individual, and, on the contrary, it was admitted that the Corporation of Dublin of that day rented seventy four houses and invited over English Protestant merchants from Bristol, and when Mary's persecution ceased, sent them and their families back safely to their homes. Leland, a Protestant historian, writing on this subject, says :—

“ Such was the spirit of toleration that many English families, friends to the Reformation, took refuge in Ireland, and there enjoyed their opinions without molestation.”

And a Protestant writer, Taylor, in his *History of the Civil Wars of Ireland*, testifies as follows :—

“ The restoration of the old religion was effected without violence ; no persecution of the Protestants was attempted, and several of the English who fled from the furious zeal of Mary's inquisitors, found a safe refuge among the Catholics of Ireland. It is but justice to this maligned body to add, that on three occasions of their obtaining the upper hand, they never injured a single person in life or limb for professing a religion different to their own. They had suffered persecution and learned mercy, as they showed in the reign of Mary, in the wars from 1641 to 1648, and during the brief triumph of James II.”

SECOND PERIOD OF CATHOLIC POWER—1641.

I pass now to the second period of the Catholic power—namely, 1641. As a sample of what the British electorate were induced to believe last July, it will be interesting to you to hear a few words on this subject from a leaflet issued from Mr. Sidebottom, the successful Tory candidate for Hyde :—

“ Q. Have the Irish ever had Home Rule, and how did they behave ?

“ A. They murdered every Englishman and Protestant they could lay their hands on in 1641. They were set on by the priests, who said that Protestants were devils and served the devil, and that the killing of them was a meritorious act. Altogether they killed in that year 150,000 Protestants—men and women and children.”

This puts in a somewhat exaggerated form a very common accusation in the mouths of your enemies. The story of a wholesale

massacre of Protestants in the rising of 1641 has been repeatedly proved to be utterly groundless. Mr. Lecky, whose bias cannot be said to be in favour of either the Catholics or Nationalists of Ireland, speaks of it as follows :—

“The rebellion only assumed its general character in consequence of the resolution of the English House of Commons, that no toleration should be henceforth granted to the Catholic religion in Ireland. It was this policy that drove the Catholic gentry of Ireland very reluctantly into rebellion. The rebellion was a defensive war, entered into in order to secure a toleration of the religion of the Irish people. . . . *It may boldly be asserted that the statement of a general and organized massacre is utterly and absolutely untrue.* As is almost always the case with popular risings, there were in the first outbreak of the rebellion some murders, but there were very few, and there was nothing whatever in the nature of a massacre. . . . The rebellion was not one due to any single cause, but it represented the accumulated wrongs and animosities of two generations. All the long train of agrarian wrongs from Mullaghmast to the latest inquisitions of Wentworth, all the long succession of religious wrongs from the Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth to the Confiscation of the Irish College under Charles, contributed to the result.”

The Protestant historian Leland, says :—

“The Catholic priests laboured zealously to moderate the excesses of war, and frequently protected Protestants when danger threatened them, by concealing them in their places of worship, and even under their altars.”

And the history of Dr. Bedell, the Protestant Bishop of Dromore, who during a considerable portion of the rising enjoyed the respect of the insurgents, and on his death was followed to his grave by one of O’Neill’s regiments, is proof enough of the absurdity and untruthfulness of the story of a general massacre of Protestants.

The rebellion culminated in the assembling of the Confederation of Kilkenny, which was really a Catholic Parliament, and our enemies will search its records in vain for any single measure evincing a spirit of persecution.

THIRD PERIOD OF CATHOLIC POWER—1689.

I pass now to the third period, that of James's Parliament of 1689. In this Parliament there were only six Protestants members of the House of Commons, and some ten or twelve in the House of Lords. Yet, so far were the Catholics from excluding Protestants as Protestants from Parliament, that six Protestant Bishops sat in the House of Peers, and no Catholic Prelate was admitted at all. This Parliament consisted then for the most part of Catholics animated by the memory of the most bitter wrongs. They were the sons of men who without trial and without compensation had been robbed of their estates. The confiscations of Ulster, the fraud of Charles, the atrocities of Strafford, were to them recent and vivid events. At last power had changed hands and rested with them. How did they use it? To persecute and oppress? To retaliate for old wrongs? No; the first act of that Parliament was to establish perfect religious equality, and to guarantee to Protestants full liberty of professing, practising, and teaching their religion. On the evidences of religious toleration in the past history of Ireland, Mr. Lecky says:—

“ Irish history contains its full share of violence and massacre, but whoever will examine these episodes with impartiality, may easily convince himself that their connection with religion has been most superficial. Religious cries have been sometimes raised, religious enthusiasm has been often appealed to in the agony of a struggle; but the real causes have usually been the conflicts of races and classes, the struggle of nationality against annihilation. Amongst the Catholics at least, religious intolerance has never been a prevailing vice, and those who have studied closely the history and character of the Irish people, can hardly fail to be struck with the deep respect for sincere religion in every form which they have commonly evinced. Their original conversion to Christianity was probably accompanied by less violence and bloodshed than that of any equally considerable nation in Europe; and in spite of the fearful calamities which followed the Reformation, it is a memorable fact that not a single Protestant suffered for his religion in Ireland during all the period of the Marian persecution in England. The treatment of Bedell, a Protestant prelate, during the outbreak of 1641, and the act establishing

liberty of conscience, passed by the Irish Parliament of 1689, in the full flush of the brief Catholic Ascendancy under James II. exhibit very remarkably this aspect of the Irish character."

The same spirit was displayed by Irish Catholics to the first Quaker mission ; and it is recorded than in 1712 James Hoskins, accompanied by several Dublin Quakers, went preaching his doctrines through Connemara, which was exclusively Catholic, without meeting with the slightest molestation. The experience of Wesley, half a century later, was similar. He has recorded in his journal that he found more respectful hearers amongst the Catholics of Ireland than in most parts of England ; and he speaks in warm appreciation of "the tolerant spirit of the Catholics of Ireland."

FOURTH PERIOD OF CATHOLIC POWER—TO-DAY.

One word now as to the present, and I have done. At the present day Catholics have not the power of persecution by fire or sword ; but they possess a supremacy in many directions which, if guided by a spirit of intolerance, could effectually harass and oppress the Protestant population. All the world knows how that power is used. When in 1873 the representatives of the Irish people met in conference in this room to assert their demand for Home Rule, a resolution was unanimously adopted, and I am glad to remember it was proposed by my own father, in these words :—

"While we believe that in an Irish Parliament the rights and liberties of all classes of our countrymen would find their best and surest protection, we are willing that there should be incorporated in the Federal Constitution articles supplying the amplest guarantees, that no legislation shall be adopted to establish any religious ascendancy in Ireland, or to subject any person to disabilities on account of his religious opinions."

From that day to this the Catholic majority has acted upon that principle. The most Catholic constituencies in Ireland return to-day Protestant members to Parliament. Catholic cities elect Protestants to the highest civic honours. Catholic Corporations employ Protestant officials ; and last, but not least, the leader of

the Irish race, to whom his Catholic fellow-countrymen are bound by the strongest links of personal affection and political devotion, is a Protestant Irishman. No ! we Catholic Irishmen repudiate this accusation of intolerance with scorn and indignation. We do not even understand the meaning of the words religious bigotry. By the Irish nation we do not mean any class, or sect, or creed. By Irish independence we mean liberty for every Irishman, whether in his veins runs the blood of the Kelt or the Norman, the Cromwellian or the Williamite, whether he professes the ancient faith of Ireland, or that newer creed which has given to our country some of the bravest and purest of her patriots. We are banded together in a struggle for our national rights, and, as a Catholic Irishman, I assert my belief, that never again would the Catholics of Ireland lift hand or voice to obtain an Irish Parliament did they not know that the edifice of national freedom which it would raise would be based upon the most perfect civil and religious liberty of every Irishman, of every class and creed.

In conclusion it only remains for me to say, that I trust I have established my propositions to your satisfaction, and to thank you for the indulgent patience with which you have heard me.



The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) **Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill.** By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) **The Orange Bogey.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) **The Chicago Convention.** By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P.
- (4) **The Irish Land Crisis.**
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (5) **The "Castle" System.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (6) **The Truth about '98.** By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P.
- (7) **Irish Industries and English Legislation.**
By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (8) **The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.**
By CHARLES DAWSON, EX-M.P.
- (9) **An Irish Judge on the Irish Question.**
With Introduction by J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (10) **Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.**
By ALFRED WEBB.
- (11) **Irish Protestants and Home Rule.**
By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P
Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- The Elections of 1885.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- Coercion.** By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

Price One Penny each.

A Word for Ireland. By T. M. HEALY, B.L. Price 1s.

Report on the Present State of the Irish Land Question.

By A LAND VALUER. Price 6d.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms, to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.



Other Tracts in preparation.

The Irish Question.

THE
ALLEGED MASSACRE OF 1641:
BY
ALFRED WEBB,

One of the Vice-Presidents of the Irish Protestant Home Rule Association.

“ ‘Tis slander ;
Whose edge is sharper than the sword ; whose tongue
Outvenoms all the worms of Nile ; whose breath
Rides on the posting winds, and doth belie
All corners of the world : kings, queens, and states,
Maids, matrons, nay, the secrets of the grave
This viperous slander enters.”—*Cymbeline*.

LONDON :
THE IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 25 PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1887

Price One Penny.

Such merit as there is in this tract is largely due to the suggestions and assistance of JOHN J. CLANCY, M.P., COUNT PLUNKETT, EDMUND HARVEY, and a near relative of my own.

A. W.

Dublin, December, 1886.

THE ALLEGED MASSACRE OF 1641.

NOTHING can be more unfair than the attempt now made to prove from history that the Irish people are unfit for self-government. If the Newgate Calendar be a true record of a people's life—if occasional tunults, and wreckings, and riots, and burnings, be an index of the average condition of a people, and of their possibilities—if the doings of a people under unhappy circumstances are to be nicely compared with the doings of a people amidst happy surroundings—if the religious rancours of the middle ages be held as present in one nation, while extinct in surrounding nations—if the political corruption universally prevalent in the last century be regarded as incapacitating the descendants of one nation, and of one alone, from free institutions in the present—we may indeed abandon ourselves to despair.

It has suited one party in Ireland, and a great many parties out of it, to lend themselves for generations to the task of traducing the Irish. The highest intellects, the most brilliant talents, have been prostituted to the work, and too many Irishmen have been almost brought to believe in the degeneracy of their own people. Well is it for us, that there have always been enough clear sighted, thoughtful, and fiery spirits, to pierce through the clouds of calumny in which the national life has been shrouded, to sustain our self-respect, and keep alive the seeds of hope and manhood, for fruition in better times, such as the present.

To prove our innate wickedness, to show that religious toleration and respect for other peoples' opinions are foreign to Irish thought and impossible of development in an Irish atmosphere, no one event is oftener referred to than the “Massacre of 1641.”

Crude and garbled accounts of what is said to have then occurred are freely circulated.*

Upon thoughtful men, who have looked below the surface of history, and learned to what a large extent the lower tendencies of human nature have been ineradicably mixed up with the noblest movements of mankind towards truth, and liberty and right, such representations have no effect. Were even the worst true, we should decline to be moved in our estimate of what is best for a people now, by crimes which a section of that people committed more than two hundred and forty years ago.

The question of Home Government for Ireland is to be settled by an appeal to common sense and reason, by what we see going on around us in the world, by the consideration of how we are likely to act under free institutions in the light of the nineteenth century, by the fact that we are not a nation of fools and knaves. Situated as we are between two of the freest nations in the world—Great Britain and the United States—and in closest intercourse with them, it is reasonable to suppose, that whilst it would be impossible permanently to govern us, except through the medium of free institutions, it would be impossible for us, even if we were so minded, to revert to the alleged methods of the past, and wrest those free institutions to the ruin of any class of our fellow countrymen, without jeopardizing what we have so long striven for—our own freedom.

None the less is it our duty, wherever possible, to clear the fair fame of our country from aspersion. I therefore devote myself, having already given some attention to the subject, to the task of considering what really occurred in Ireland in 1641.

* Here is an extract from a leaflet which was issued in the interest of one of the candidates in the late contest for the Hyde division of Cheshire :—

“Q. Have the Irish ever had Home Rule, and how did they behave?”

“A. They murdered every Englishman and Protestant they could lay hands on in 1641. They were set on by the priests, who said that Protestants were devils and served the devil, and that the killing of them was a meritorious act. Altogether they killed in that year 150,000 Protestants, men, and women, and children.”

In doing so, I shall base my statements altogether upon standard writers, several of whom are English, and all of whom are, so far as I know, Protestants.*

WHAT LED UP TO THE EVENTS OF 1641.

Upon the accession of James I. in 1603, says Mr. Smiles,† “the penal laws enacted in the reign of Elizabeth, were revived in all their original harshness. Sir Arthur Chichester, the new Lord Lieutenant, a man cruel and avaricious in his character, and eager to amass wealth and possessions, no matter in what manner, willingly seconded all the designs of the persecuting monarch. The Catholic chapels were shut up, and the most wanton oppressions and extortions were resorted to, such as fine, imprisonment, and deprivation of office, for enforcing attendance at the Protestant service. To put an end to all doubts, also, as to James’s being favourable to religious toleration, he issued a proclamation, giving due notice to all concerned, of his thoroughly intolerant disposition and character. This singular proclamation commences thus :— ‘Whereas, his Majesty is informed, that his subjects of Ireland have been deceived by a false report, that his Majesty was disposed to allow them liberty of conscience, and the free choice of a religion ; he hereby declares to his beloved subjects of Ireland, that he will not admit of any such liberty of conscience as they were made to expect by such report,’ etc. And then the proclamation goes on to order the expulsion of the Catholic bishops, Jesuits, and all other ministers of the Catholic worship, and to

* This has prevented me from drawing on Prendergast, Gilbert, and other standard Irish writers. In thus, for effect, restricting myself in the main to British standard and Protestant writers, I must entirely repudiate the supposition that Irish and Catholic writers are not of as much credit as others regarding the history of their own country.

† Three of the *notes* do not refer to Protestant authorities.

† *History of Ireland and the Irish People under the Government of England*, by Samuel Smiles, M.D. [author of *Self Help*, etc.], London, 1884 ; p. 67.

prohibit altogether, the exercise of the Catholic religion both in England and Ireland."

"THE FLIGHT OF THE EARLS."

The great northern chieftains, the Earls of Tirone and Tirconnell had shortly before this period submitted to the English crown. Though they were shorn of much of their influence, the government was suspicious, and watched narrowly for any opportunity to destroy them. A galling system of espionage was instituted over Ulster, so that Tirone complained that "he could not even drink a full carouse of sack, but that the state was within a few hours advertized thereof." Insulted by the King's officers, harassed by litigation, worried by spies, watched by a crowd of carpet baggers thirsting for his estates, the Earl of Tirone appears to have dropped some incautious words. "There is no reason to suppose that this vague talk was in any way serious; but whatever it was, Lord Howth, who was admitted by the government to be unworthy of credit, managed to obtain an inkling of it, developed it into a cut-and-dried plot to seize the castle and murder the deputy, and embodied it in a letter, which he purposely dropped at the door of the council chamber." *

The Earl of Tirone received information that it was the intention of the government to arrest him. He and the Earl of Tirconnell determined in a panic to fly to the continent. "Conscious that their properties were marked for confiscation by a government which was ready to adopt every expedient to increase its power, and at the same time break the spirit of the Irish people, they took to flight." † They hastened with their families on board a vessel lying in Lough Swilly, and eventually reached Rome. There the Earl of Tirconnell died the following year,

* *A Short History of the Kingdom of Ireland, from the Earliest Times to the Union with Great Britain*, with five maps and appendices, by Charles G. Walpole, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Second Edition, London, 1885; p. 178. † Smiles, 68.

1608. The Earl of Tirone, the great O'Neill, broken and blind, lingered eight years longer.*

By the flight of these Earls, the door was at once thrown open for the wide and wholesale confiscation and plantation of Ulster.

THE CONFISCATION AND PLANTATION OF ULMSTER.

Edmund Burke writes as follows :—

“Unheard of confiscations were made in the northern parts, upon grounds of plots and conspiracies, never proved upon their supposed authors. The war of chicane succeeded to the war of arms and of hostile statutes : and a regular series of operations were carried on, particularly from Chichester’s time, in the ordinary courts of justice, and by special commissions and inquisitions ; first, under pretence of tenures and then of titles in the crown, for the purpose of the total extirpation of the interest of the natives in their own soil.”†

Six counties were held to be escheated to the crown. The old order of things was to be wiped out, and the north was to be treated “as if his Majesty were to begin a new plantation in some part of America.” According to law all that would have fallen to the crown was the freehold lands of the persons attainted. “Though it suited the government in 1604 [when the Irish lords submitted] to cut down the rights of the chieftains to their demesnes, to exalt the lesser chiefs into freeholders, and to hold out fixity of tenure as the great benefit to be obtained by the introduction of English law and the creation of shireground ; in 1610 the theory was that the fee of the chieftains extended to the whole soil of Ulster, and that the newly created freeholders were no better than tenants at will.”‡

These proceedings were an outrage upon common honesty : they violated all the conditions of government and law, assuming that law and government are constituted for the protection and happiness of the inhabitants of a country. They would have

* They are buried in front of the altar of S. Pietro di Montorio, on the Janiculum.

† Burke’s *Works*, vi. 336.

‡ Walpole, 180.

violated the sense of right of the English people who had lived under the feudal law for five centuries and a half. But they were even more unjustifiable in the eyes of the Irish people, who had only just been brought under the feudal law—who had from time immemorial lived under the Brehon code—under their own laws and customs, which, whilst conceding great powers and privileges to their chieftains and lords, in no degree acknowledged their absolute proprietorship in the land of the territories which they governed. The confiscation of the rights of the Irish people in the lands which they occupied, because their chieftains had or had not engaged in conspiracies against the government, was entirely opposed to the ideas of right and wrong of the Irish people.

The six counties which were confiscated contained about 3,785,000 statute acres. They were surveyed and divided into “lean” and “fat” land. Protestant settlers were drawn from England and Scotland. Extensive districts were divided amongst London guilds: 286 natives of “good merit” were granted one half of the fat land: others were transplanted to “convenient places” in Kerry, Tipperary, and Roscommon. Some of them were allocated portions of the lean lands. “Slowly and sullenly,” says Mr. Walpole, “the Irish gentry removed themselves and their belongings into the contracted localities to which they had been appointed, away from the ‘fat lands’ to the ‘lean lands,’ from the rich pastures to the barren moor. Slowly and sullenly the mass of the people followed them, thrust out of their homes, to find new refuges wherein to lay their heads; some amongst the servitors, some in the ‘lean lands,’ some transplanted in gangs at the command of the government into waste land which no one wanted in Munster and Connaught. Exiled to make room for the planters, evicted, though promised security, they wandered forth, bearing in their hearts a store of bitter hatred for the invaders who had broken faith with them.” (Fixity of tenure for the mass of the Irish people, had in 1604, upon the cutting down of the rights of the chieftains, been held out as the great benefit to be

obtained by the introduction of English law and the creation of shireground.)

Goldwin Smith writes as follows of these doings :—“ The disinheritance of the ancient race was carried on not only by high-handed violence, but by a system, which became a trade of the meanest and most infamous chicane.”*

I may appear to linger too long over this history ; but a correct knowledge of it is necessary for a clear comprehension of what followed.

And so the plantation of the north was accomplished. Settlers poured in : fair castles, mansions, and substantial farm buildings sprang up on all sides. There were gardens and orchards, and fields in “ good tillage after the English manner.” Market towns and villages were rising with paved streets and well-built houses. Schools and bridges were in course of construction.†

THE NATIVES AND THE SETTLERS.

But the mass of the native inhabitants could not be dispensed with as hewers of wood and drawers of water. Their removal was from time to time suspended ; and, only too ready to get back on the soil at any price and at any risk, they took up from the settlers upon ruinous terms, small plots, once their own property.

The two peoples were face to face and commingled. It may be said that the settlers represented a “ higher civilization.” They came from a long settled country, England. The manners and customs of the Irish were different. They had for the most part led a pastoral life. The clan system had engaged them in war and in forays, and the war constantly made on them by England prevented them from cultivating the arts of peace. All possibility of the proper development of the Irish people had been cut off by the manner in which their religion and their education were banned. They were, in the main, poor and uncultured.

* Goldwin Smith’s *Irish History and Irish Character*, p. 101.

† Walpole, 185.

But their lives and happiness were of as great importance to themselves as were the lives and happiness of better off and more civilized people. The ties of husband and wife, of friend and friend, were as powerful. The happiness of their children had as great claims upon them. The charms of youth and the graces of maidenhood were amongst them. Upon an occasion later in the history of Ireland, a Protestant bishop was asked by insurgents in possession of a district, to come up with them on a hill, to be eye-witness of the havoc the King's army was making as it advanced. A train of fire too clearly distinguished their line of march—flaming up from the houses of the unfortunate peasants : “They are only a few cabins,” remarked the bishop, as reported in his own account of the transaction ; “and he had scarcely uttered the words when he felt the imprudence of them. ‘A poor man's cabin,’ answered one of the rebels, ‘is to him as valuable as a palace.’”*

And this general policy of spoliation, repression, and religious intolerance was maintained up to the breaking out of the insurrection in 1641.

WHAT REALLY OCCURRED IN 1641.

Ruthlessly deprived of their lands, debarred the exercise of their religion, what was the duty of the Irish people, if a spark of manhood existed in them ? (I speak not now of the doctrines promulgated in the Sermon on the Mount—but of the ethics upon which the mass of humanity have always acted, and do act at present.) What was the duty of the Irish people ? To rise at the first possible opportunity, drive out the invaders, and repossess themselves of their homesteads. It is what all history, all poetry, all high feeling command a people to do under similar circumstances. It is what any nation or section of a nation would do at the present day. It is what the English especially would

* Bishop Stock's *Narrative of what passed at Killalla in the Summer of 1798* ; p. 135. The Bishop writes in the third person.

do. It is what the Irish people did. A long interval such as has elapsed since 1641 alters feelings and right in such matters ; but thirty years—never ! Charles I. was at war with his Parliament, the British power in Ireland was weakened, and on the 23rd October, 1641, the Irish people rose. A dreadful war, with frightful atrocities on both sides, commenced ; but there is absolutely no evidence of a general massacre, preconcerted or other, by the Irish.

It might almost be enough to quote the opinion of William E. H. Lecky,* one of the most careful historians of the day—who has investigated the subject with all the side lights which Mr. Froude has been able to throw upon it :—

“ I shall be content, if I have conveyed to the reader, my own firm conviction that the common assertion, that the rebellion of 1641 began with a general massacre of Protestants, is entirely untrue, although in the course of the long and savage struggle that ensued, great numbers of Englishmen were undoubtedly murdered. The number of the victims, however, though very great, has been enormously and often deliberately exaggerated. The horrors of the struggle were much less exceptional than has been supposed. The worst crimes were the unpremeditated and isolated acts of a half-savage population, and it is very far from clear, upon which side the balance of cruelty rests. ‘ The truth is,’ as Warner [a Protestant historian of pronounced anti-Catholic views] truly says, ‘ the soldiers and common people were very savage on both sides ; ’ nothing can be more scandalously disingenuous, than the method of those writers who have employed themselves in elaborating ghastly pictures of the crimes that were committed on one side, while they have at the same time systematically concealed those which were committed on the other. From the very beginning the English Parliament did the

* Mr. Lecky, I deeply regret to say, is one of the most distinguished literary authorities of the present “ Paper-Unionist ” party ; but all his historical writings, so far as they relate to Ireland, are, perhaps unconsciously, one long and most powerful argument for Home Rule.

utmost in its power to give the contest the character of a war of extermination.”*

Dr. John McDonnell, an Irish Protestant writer of studied moderation, says:—“In short, in this war the Roman Catholics fought to recover their liberties and property, and to secure their religion ; the Puritans, to confirm and extend the tyranny inflicted on Ireland by centuries of misgovernment.”†

The wishes and objects of the insurgents are fully stated under nineteen heads, by Sir John Temple.‡ There is nothing whatever in them showing a desire to sever the connection between England and Ireland, or to persecute or extirpate the Protestants.

Great atrocities must undoubtedly have been committed by the Irish. But, as human nature is, it is no wonder. For centuries they themselves had been treated almost as wild beasts.

THE IRISH TREATED AS WILD BEASTS.

In 1575, in the war with O’Neill, Sir John Norris made a descent on the island of Rathlin, and after a fierce assault the garrison yielded at discretion. I will tell what followed in Mr. Froude’s words :—

“Every living creature in the place except the chief and his family, who were probably reserved for ransom, were immediately put to the sword. Two hundred were killed in the castle. It was then discovered, that several hundred more, chiefly mothers and their little ones, were hidden in the caves about the shore. There was no remorse, not even the faintest shadow of perception that the occasion called for it. They were hunted out as if they had been seals or otters, and all destroyed. Surleyboy and the other chiefs, Essex coolly wrote, had sent their wives and children into the island, ‘which be all taken and executed to the number of six hundred.’”*

* *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, by W. E. H. Lecky, London, 1878 ; v. ii. p. 155.

† *The Ulster Civil War of 1641 and its Consequences*, by John McDonnell, M.D., Dublin, 1879 ; p. 149.

‡ Temple, *Irish Rebellion*, 73.

§ Froude’s *History of England*, xi. 185.

THE HORRORS OF THE DESMOND WAR.

Mr. Froude narrates what was enacted by the Queen's troops in the Desmond war, fifty-eight years before 1641 :—

“ The entire province of Munster was utterly depopulated. Hecatombs of helpless creatures, the aged, and the sick, and the blind, the young mother and the babe at the breast, had fallen under the English sword.”*

EXTERMINATION IN TIRONE.

The same horrors had been enacted in other parts of Ireland a few years previously :—

“ At Christmas,” writes Sir Nicholas Malby to Walsingham, as cited by Mr. Froude, “ I marched into their country, and finding courteous dealing with them had like to have cut my throat. I thought good to take another course ; and so with determination to consume them with fire and sword, sparing neither old nor young, I entered their mountains. I burnt all their corn and houses, and committed to the sword all that could be found, where were slain at that time above sixty of their best men, and among them the best leaders they had. This was Shan Burke’s country. Then I burnt Ulick Burke’s country in like manner. I assaulted a castle where the garrison surrendered. I put them to the misericordia of my soldiers. They were all slain. Thence I went on, sparing none which came in my way, which cruelty did so amaze their followers that they could not tell where to bestow themselves. Shan Burke made means to me to pardon him and forbear killing of his people. I would not hearken, but held on my way. The gentlemen of Clanrickard came to me : I found it was but dallying to win time ; so I left Ulick as little corn and as few houses standing as I had left his brother, and what people was found had as little favour as the other had. It was all done in rain and frost and storm, journeys in such weather bringing them the sooner to submission. They are humble enough now, and will yield to any terms we like to offer them.” Mr. Froude continues :— “ Where the people were quiet there was the rope for malefactors, and death by ‘ natural law’ for those whom the law written would not touch. Where they broke out there was the blazing homestead, and death by the sword for all, not for the armed kerne only, but for the aged and infirm, the nursing mother, and the baby at the breast.”†

* Froude’s *England*, xi. 259.

† *Ib. xi. 197.*

BRITISH ATROCITIES IN 1641.

And during this very war of 1641, in which the Irish are supposed and said by many, even to this day, to have been the authors of the chief or all the abominations that occurred, they were the victims of atrocities that could scarcely be paralleled in any other country. On this point, Dr. John McDonnell writes :—

“ The murders and massacres by the Irish were almost always, as I have said, perpetrated by mobs, and the Roman Catholic gentry and the Kilkenny provisional government uniformly exerted themselves to prevent them ; whereas the English murders and massacres were usually perpetrated by the organized forces of the government, or even by direct order of the government itself or its officers ; as when Ormond was commissioned by Parsons and Borlase to drive the rebels from a station a few miles from Dublin, his orders were ‘ to burn and destroy their haunts, and to kill all the inhabitants capable of bearing arms ; ’ and when (as we are informed by Dr. Borlase, whose history of these transactions was written in defence of his near relative the Lord Justice) Sir W. Cole’s regiment killed 2,400 rebels in battle, but besides ‘ a starved and famished of the vulgar sort, whose goods were seized on by this regiment, 7,000.’ ”*

Carte, as quoted by Dr. McDonnell, writes of a raid made by the British garrison of Carrickfergus, on Island Magee, in 1642, “ in which it is affirmed that over 3,000 harmless Irishmen, women, and children, were cruelly massacred.”

In the winter of 1641, the English garrison of Antrim fell on the Irish and Catholic tenants of a neighbouring proprietor near Templepatrick, and “ murdered about eighty persons, men, women, and children.” This was in revenge for the supposed murder of their own wives and children who turned up safe and well shortly afterwards. †

In the course of the war, certain Irish troops were drafted to Scotland and served bravely and faithfully under Montrose. They were eventually defeated, and delivered up their arms.

* McDonnell, 139 ; and Borlase’s *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, 87. † McDonnell, 55.

Chiefly at the instance of the Scottish clergy, who quoted : “ Now go smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not, but slay man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass,” these prisoners were marched into a court-yard, and in cold blood shot down to a man. One hundred and fifty Irish soldiers who accompanied Sir Alaster M'Donnell, met the same fate in May, 1646 ; 300 women were slain in the camp ; 80 other women and children, fugitives, were overtaken at Linlithgow by the Covenanters, who flung them over a high bridge into the Avon, fifty feet below. “ There they were all drowned ; for a few who reached the banks were thrust back by pikes and destroyed. Thus, man and woman, infant and suckling, perished ; for again and again were the conquerors told, that the curses which befel those who spared the enemies of God, would fall upon him who suffered one Amalekite to escape.” *

I quote again from Mr. Lecky :—

“ I shall not attempt to go through the long catalogue of horrors that have been too often paraded ; it is sufficient to say, that [in the war which ensued] the soldiers of Sir Charles Coote, of St. Leger, of Sir F. Hamilton, and of others, rivalled the worst crimes that were perpetrated in the days of Carew and Mountjoy. ‘ The soldiers,’ says Carte, ‘ in executing the orders of the justices, murdered all persons promiscuously, not sparing the women, and sometimes not children.’ . . . The saying —‘ Nits will make lice,’ which was constantly employed to justify the murder of Irish children, then came into use. ‘ Sir W. Parsons,’ writes Sir Maurice Eustace to Ormonde, at a later stage of the rebellion, ‘ has by late letters advised the governor to the burning of corn, and to put man, woman, and child to the sword.’ ” *

Such evidence might be indefinitely extended. Enough will be found in the second volume of Mr. Lecky’s *History of England*.

I dwell upon these horrors to show the spirit of the times ; to prove that it is impossible but that outrages must have been committed by my countrymen in the strife, they being only human. And now for the supposed massacre, regarding which Mr. Lecky

* McDonnell, 121.

† Lecky, ii. 157.

says :—“ I shall be content if I have conveyed to the reader, my own firm conviction, that the common assertion that the rebellion of 1641 began with a general massacre of Protestants, is entirely untrue.”

THE SUPPOSED MASSACRE.

The character of Borlase and Parsons, who were the chief governors of Ireland upon the breaking out of the insurrection, powerfully influenced the course of affairs. “ There is good reason to believe that they adopted measures deliberately with the intention of promoting and extending the rebellion, with a view to cause great confiscations. They were both staunch Puritans ; but Borlase was a mere soldier, and was led by Parsons. Parsons was an extremely wicked man.” *

“ It admits of no doubt, that a policy of nursing the rebellion was pursued by them at first, for the purpose of improving the harvest of confiscations, which they hoped by and bye to reap for themselves and their friends.” †

Parsons got immense grants of lands in Meath, Cavan, Cork, Tipperary, Limerick, and Fermanagh, was afterwards appointed Surveyor-General, and in this capacity became “ enormously wealthy.” ‡

“ The most savage national and religious hatred, predisposed the English to exaggerate to the utmost the crimes of their enemies. . . . It is tolerably certain, that the constant fear lest the Catholics, by coming to terms with the government, should save their estates from confiscation, lay at the root of an immense part of the exaggerated and fantastic accounts of Irish crimes that were invented and diffused.” § This last sentence gives the key to the whole story of the alleged massacre. A massacre by the Irish of the sort alleged would have been so good an excuse for fresh extermination of the natives, and fresh confiscation of their lands.

* McDonnell, 43.

† Ib. 128.

‡ Ib. 43.

§ Lecky, ii. 147.

THE MANUSCRIPT DEPOSITIONS IN TRINITY COLLEGE.

The chief basis of the whole massacre story consists of certain depositions ; and in reference to them Mr. Lecky writes :—

“ Under circumstances that have never been very clearly ascertained, an immense mass of depositions were collected, which form thirty-two folio volumes of manuscript, in Trinity College, at Dublin ; and which have formed the materials from which Rushworth, Temple, and Borlase derived those long and sickening catalogues of horrors which made a lasting impression on the English mind. No one, I think, can compare the pages of these writers with the pictures of the rebellion furnished in the narrative of Clogy, in the correspondence of Ormond, Clanricarde, and the Lords Justices, and in the report and depositions of the earlier commission I have cited, without perceiving the enormous, palpable exaggerations they display, and the absolute incredibility of many of their narratives. Hearsay evidence of the loosest kind was freely admitted. Twenty or thirty depositions often relate to a single crime. Supernatural incidents are related without a question ; the depositions are almost always undated ; and the immense number of the murders they speak of staggers belief, especially when it is remembered that all the writers who speak of a general massacre place it in the first weeks of the rebellion, concerning which we have so much detailed evidence. Ormond, who had, probably, beyond all other men, the best means of knowing the truth on this matter, appears to have thought very lightly of them. At the time of the Act of Settlement, when the claims of the ‘innocents’ were canvassed, the House of Commons, which consisted mainly of Puritan adventurers, who desired to restrict as much as possible the estates that were restored, proposed that none of those whose names were found in this collection of depositions might be accepted ; and it is a very significant fact that Ormond, who was then Lord Lieutenant, positively refused the proposal. ‘His Grace,’ adds the best historian of the rebellion, who had himself carefully examined these documents, ‘it is probable, knew too much of these examinations, and the methods used in procuring them, to give them such a stamp of authority ; or otherwise it would have been the clearest and shortest proof of the guilt of such as were named in them.’ Carte, who examined this period with the assistance of private papers of the most valuable description, emphatically recorded his distrust of these documents. The authority of Lord Castlehaven is of less value, for he was a Catholic, and a commander of the rebels ; but there is no reason to doubt that he was a man of truth,

humanity, and honour ; and his testimony is that of a contemporary. While admitting fully that great atrocities were committed by his co-religionists during the rebellion, he denounces in indignant language the monstrous exaggerations that were current, and positively asserts that Sir John Temple, in a catalogue of horrors he extracted from the depositions I am referring to, speaks of many hundreds as then murdered, who at the time the book was published were alive and well.”*

Relative to these documents, we have the opinion of Edmund Burke. In a letter to his son in Ireland, dated the 20th March, 1792, he advises him, in the interest of the Catholics, to copy portions of what he terms, “ the rascally collection in the College relative to the pretended massacre in 1641. . . . I am sure, wicked as they are, and mostly hearsay, they refute fully the false stories produced on their credit by Temple. Leland went over them with me and poor Bowden, long since dead. We agreed about them.”†

In the middle of the last century, Dr. Warner examined these depositions with great care, and discussed them candidly and fully. He was a clergyman, a Fellow of Trinity College, and so decided a Protestant that he strongly censured the liberty allowed to Catholics by Charles I., and clearly intimated his disapproval of the relaxations of the Penal Code which took place in his own day. Much he describes as “incredible,” “ridiculous,” and “contradictory.” “The reason why so many idle, silly tales were registered of what this body heard another body say, as to swell the collection to two-and-thirty thick

* Lecky, ii. 147.

† I sought in vain through Burke’s *Works* for this opinion, to which I was aware he had given utterance. Count Plunkett, to whom I applied in my difficulty, at once pointed it out to me in Fitzwilliam’s *Correspondence of Edmund Burke*, iii. 441. He also drew my attention in notes of conversation between Hume and Burke, reported in Bisset’s *Life of Edmund Burke*, ii. 426, in which “Mr. Burke endeavoured to prove that the received accounts [of 1641] were in a great degree unfounded, or at least very much exaggerated, and quoted affidavits in Trinity College, Dublin. He described various absurd stories that have been propagated and believed by many concerning the Irish.”

volumes in folio closely written, it is easier to conjecture than to commend.”*

Yet it is these documents to the sustaining of which a considerable work has, apparently at the instance of Mr. Froude, been lately devoted.†

My own examination of the documents confirms all that Burke, Lecky, and Warner, and others have said about them.

SIR JOHN TEMPLE'S BOOK.

There was a certain Sir John Temple, than whom no one profited more by the War of 1641, and by the spread of sensational accounts of the conduct of the Irish Catholics. He was in 1648 appointed a Commissioner of the Great Seal; in 1653, a Commissioner of Forfeited Estates. He received large land grants in the counties of Carlow and Dublin. He was afterwards made Master of the Rolls and Vice-Chancellor of Ireland. He was one of the vultures that, in Goldwin Smith's words, “descended upon Ireland.”

In 1646 he published the thin brown leather quarto which has perhaps brought more misery on our country than any other book ever published has on any other country.‡ No library of Irish books is complete without it. A copy lies before me. Treasured and studied in Puritan households throughout the length and breadth of Great Britain and Ireland, carried across the seas wherever English speaking peoples have emigrated, it

* Dr. Warner's *History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland*, Second Edition, p. 146.

† For an admirable little work exposing some of Miss Hickson's contradictions and inconsistencies, see Dr. John McDonnell's *Light of History respecting the Massacres in Ireland*, Dublin, 1886.

‡ *The Irish Rebellion: or, a History of the Beginnings and First Progress of the General Rebellion, Raised within the Kingdom of Ireland, upon the Three and Twentieth day of October, 1641, together with the Barbarous Cruelties and Bloody Massacres which ensued thereupon*, Published in the year 1646, by Sir John Temple, Kt., Master of the Rolls, and one of his Majesty's most Honourable Privy Council within the Kingdom of Ireland. [The edition to which I make reference is the sixth, published in Dublin in 1724.]

was regarded as an almost infallible witness against Catholicism. Well do I remember the horror with which in my childhood I hung over its pages, and feasted on the unimaginable cruelties depicted on the frontispiece. This is the “ undefiled well ” from which succeeding generations and historians have drawn their ideas of the “ Massacre of 1641.”

Temple’s conclusion is : “ There being since the rebellion first broke out, unto the time of the cessation made Sept. 15, 1643, which was not full two years after, above 300,000 British and Protestants were cruelly murthured in cold blood, destroyed some other way, or expelled out of their habitations,’ according to the strictest conjecture and computation, of those who seemed best to understand the numbers of English planted in Ireland, besides those few which perished in the heat of the fight during the war.”*

I have carefully examined the depositions in Sir John Temple’s book. It is to be presumed they are the most striking of those in Trinity College. The same deponent often figures twice and even thrice on different pages. It does not appear that more than fifteen accounts are given by eye-witnesses ; and a comparison of these with the originals, still further tends to shake my confidence in them as truthful narrations. The rest are hearsay—“ that by credible report,” “ she heard,” “ as is commonly reported,” and so-forth—or simple statements of belief in certain occurrences. A considerable number relate only to threats or boasts on the part of the Irish.

All the “ horrid inhuman cruelties,” such as boiling children alive, burying alive, and the unearthly atrocities depicted on the frontispiece of some editions of Temple’s work, are not mentioned in the depositions of a single one of those who testify to what they themselves saw. They are stated purely on hearsay. What occurred, even if we believe all those “ direct ” depositions, consisted of very little more than the ordinary incidents of a war, in

* Temple, 6.

which, as we have already said, great barbarities were committed on both sides.

It is remarkable that, with the exception of one case, these acts of cruelty are not mentioned in the first series of depositions taken in January, February, and March 1641-2, and to be found in a letter from the Lords-Justices, 7th March, 1641-2, published in the second volume of the *Thorpe Papers*.

It is also worthy of note that in none of the printed depositions, whether hearsay or otherwise, is there any hint of criminal assaults on women.

SPECIMEN FICTIONS.

The following are specimens of the evidence upon which Temple relies :—

“Elenor Fullerton, the relict of William Fullerton, late parson of Lougall, deposeth, that in Lent, 1641, a young roguing cowboy, gave out and affirmed in this deponent’s hearing, that his hands were so weary in killing and knocking down Protestants into a bog-pit, that he could hardly lift his arms to his head. Jurat. Sep. 16th, 1642.”*

Rev. Robert Maxwell, Archdeacon of Down : . . . “And further saith, that he knew one boy, that dwelt near unto himself, and not exceeding fourteen years of age, who killed at Kinnard, in one night, fifteen able strong men with his skein, they being disarmed and most of their feet in the stocks. Another not above twelve years of age killed two women at the siege of Augher. Another that was a woman and tenant to this deponent, killed several men and women, of her fellow English tenants, in one morning. And it was very usual in all parts for the rebel’s children to murder the Protestant’s children ; and sometimes with lathe-swords, heavy, and well sharpened, they would venture upon people of riper years, cruelties not to be believed, if there were not so many eye-witnesses of them. Deposeth 22 of August, 1642.”†

“Elizabeth, the wife of Captain Rice Price, of Armagh, deposeth and saith, that she and other women, whose husbands were murdered, hearing of divers apparitions and visions which were seen near Portadown bridge, since the drowning of her children, and the rest of the Protestants there, went on to the bridge aforesaid about twilight in the

* Temple, 96.

† Ib. 115.

evening ; then and there upon a sudden appeared unto them a vision or spirit, assuming the shape of a woman, waist-high upright in the water, naked, with elevated and closed hands, her hair hanging down very white, her eyes seemed to twinkle, and her skin as white as snow ; which spirit seemed to stand straight up in the water, often repeating the word, Revenge ! Revenge ! Revenge ! whereat this deponent and the rest being put into a strange amazement and affright, walked from the place. Jurat. Jan. 29, 1642."*

" Mr. George Creighton, Minister, of Virginia, in the County of Cavan, deposeth, among other particulars in his examination, that divers women brought into his house a young woman almost naked, to whom a rogue came upon the way, these women being present, and required her to give him her money or else he would kill her, and so drew his sword ; her answer was, you cannot kill me unless God give you leave, and his will be done : whereupon the rogue thrust three times at her naked body with his drawn sword, and yet never pierced her skin ; whereat he being, as it seems, much confounded, went away and left her ; and that he saw this woman, and heard this particular related by divers women, who were by and saw what they reported."†

It is unnecessary to comment on the ridiculous character of stories like those. A man who would accept them as genuine history would believe anything he desired to believe.

As we accept Mr. Lecky's and Dr. McDonnell's general estimate of Temple's book and the "massacre," the present writer feels bound to agree with them that there is evidence to prove much murder and outrage, and that at least one party of fugitives or prisoners were murdered at Portadown bridge.

Sir John Temple's book is disingenuous. The aggregate conclusions are unreliable and grossly exaggerated. Much of the evidence is of such a character as to throw serious doubts upon the whole. But we ought not to make light of all that is therein stated—or refuse sympathy to the unhappy fugitives, many of whose relatives were murdered or fell in fight, and who themselves endured the most terrible privations.

Before many years had passed, Sir John Temple himself ap-

* Temple, 122.

† Ib. 123.

pears to have been ashamed of the general scope and tendency of his work.*

DISCREPANCIES IN ESTIMATES OF NUMBERS "MASSACRED."

The discrepancies in the estimates of the numbers massacred should cause even the most credulous to pause before they believe them. Temple, makes the number of slain 150,000 in the first two months, or 300,000 in two years. Rapin gives 150,000 in about four months. The Long Parliament, 154,000. Clarendon says 40,000 or 50,000 were murdered before the Protestants suspected any danger. Hume adopts this estimate. Carte adopts Petty's computation, that 37,000 perished the first year. Lord Woodhouselee and Mr. Green accept 40,000 to 50,000. Cooke Taylor, a Protestant of Cromwellian family, "after a very careful examination of all the statements," believes that the number of persons killed by the insurgents was less than 5,000, and that about an equal number were slain by their opponents.† Dr.

* Sir John Temple "published his history of the Irish rebellion in the year 1646, by the direction of the Parliament party, which then prevailed, and to which, though long before in actual rebellion, he was always attached. The falsehoods it contains are so glaring, and numerous, that even the government, in the year 1674, seems to have been offended, and himself ashamed of the republication of it. This we gather from a letter of Capel, Earl of Essex, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to Mr. Secretary Coventry, of that date, wherein we find these words:—'I am to acknowledge yours of the 22nd of December, in which you mention a book that was newly published, concerning the cruelties committed in Ireland, at the beginning of the late war. Upon further enquiry I find Sir J. Temple, Master of the Rolls here (Ireland), author of that book, was this last year sent to by several stationers of London, to have his consent to the printing thereof; but he assures me, that he utterly denied it, and whoever printed it did it without his knowledge. This much I thought fit to add to what I formally said upon this occasion, that I might do this gentleman right, in case it were suspected, he had any share in publishing this new edition.' Stat. Let. Dub. ed. p. 2. His Lordship was, at this time, soliciting a grant of three (he would have it five) hundred pounds a year on the forfeited estates, for Sir John Temple, which he at last obtained (see these letters), and the Ministry seems to have made this republishing of his history an objection, which his Lordship thus endeavours to remove."—Dr. Curry's *Review of the Civil Wars in Ireland*, Dublin, 1775 ; 107.

† McDonnell, 185.

Warner, to whom I have already referred, says that adding all together there might be 8,000 or 12,000.* Mr. Walpole follows Warner.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST A GENERAL MASSACRE HAVING TAKEN
PLACE.

Apart from the “rascally depositions,” as Edmund Burke, himself a Protestant, described them, and Temple’s book, there is no evidence of anything like a general massacre. The theory (I quote Hume) is that “without provocation, without opposition, the astonished English, living in profound security, were massacred by their nearest neighbours, with whom they had long upheld a continued intercourse of kindness and good offices.”

Sir John Temple’s book in itself contains sufficient evidence against such a premeditated and general massacre having taken place. The first information of the rising to Charles I., then at Edinburgh, and the Lord Lieutenant, in London, was contained in a letter from the Lords Justices and Council, from Dublin, dated 25th October.† We next have a proclamation from the same authorities, “issued for the satisfaction of the lords and gentlemen of the English Pale,” dated 29th October,‡ and “upon the fifth of November, the Lords made their second dispatch to His Majesty, still at Edinburgh, in Scotland; at the same time they sent several letters into England, to the Lord Keeper, Speaker of the House of Peers, to the Speaker of the House of Commons, to the Lords of His Majesty’s Most Honourable Privy Council, to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.” Sir John Temple gives a *resume* of these letters of 5th November.§ We have also the proceedings in Parliament upon the receipt of [these letters].|| There is nothing contained in any of the above communications to favour the supposition that a massacre had taken place, or that there had been anything more than an armed rebellion or insurrection.

* Lecky, ii. 153. † Temple, 27. ‡ Ib. 34. § Ib. 42. || Ib. 43.

Two months after the 23rd October, when according to Sir John Temple and Mr. Froude, 150,000 Protestants' throats had been cut in Ulster, the following commission of enquiry was issued. Surely there would be some reference in it to murder and massacre, if the ordinary horrors of warfare had been exceeded !

“CHARLES, by the Grace of God, King of England, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc. To our well-beloved Henry Jones, Dean of Kilmore ; Roger Puttock ; William Huthock ; Randal Adams ; John Sterne ; William Aldrich ; Henry Brereton ; and John Watson, Clerks —greeting ; Whereas, divers wicked and disloyal People have lately risen in Arms in several parts of this Kingdom, and have robbed and spoiled many of our good Subjects, British and Protestants, who have been separated from their several habitations, and scattered in most lamentable manner: And for as much as it is needful take due examination concerning the same ; Know ye that we, reposing special trust and confidence in your care, diligence, and provident circumspection, have nominated and appointed you to be our Commissioners, and do hereby give unto you, or any two or more of you, full power and authority, from time to time, to call before you and examine upon Oath on the Holy Evangelists (which hereby we authorize you or any two or more of you to administer), as well all such Persons as have been robbed and despoiled, as all the witnesses that can give testimony therein, what robberies and spoils have been committed on them since the 22nd of October last, or shall hereafter be committed on them, or any of them ; What the particulars were or are, whereof they were or shall be so robbed or spoiled, to what value, by whom, and what their names are, and where they now or last dwelt that committed those robberies ; or what day or night the said robberies or spoils committed, or to be committed, were done ; What traitorous or disloyal Words, Speeches, or Actions were then or at any other time uttered or committed [by] those robbers or any of them, and how often, and all other circumstances concerning the said particulars and every of them : And you, our said Commissioners, are to reduce to writing all the examinations which you, or any two or more of you, shall take as aforesaid ; and the same to return to our Justices and Council of this our realm of Ireland, under the hands and seals of any two or more of you as aforesaid. Witness our right trusty and well-beloved counsellours, Sir William Parsons, Knight and Baronet ; and Sir John Borlase, Knight, our Justices of our said realms of Ireland : Dublin, 23rd of December, in the seventeenth year of our reign.” [1641]*

A general massacre was against the genius of the Irish people. The burnings at the stake, and the persecutions of the Jews,* which disgraced other nations in Europe throughout the middle and dark later ages, were unknown in Ireland. There were few cases of witch-burning.

Mr. Lecky bears remarkable testimony on this phase of the Irish character :—

“ Irish history contains its full share of violence and massacre, but whoever will examine these episodes with impartiality may easily convince himself that their connection with religion has been most superficial. Religious cries have been sometimes raised, religious enthusiasm has been often appealed to, in the agony of a struggle ; but the real causes have usually been the conflicts of races and classes, the struggle of a nationality against annihilation, the invasion of property in land, or the pressure of extreme poverty. Amongst the Catholics at least religious intolerance has never been a prevailing vice, and those who have studied closely the history and character of the Irish people can hardly fail to be struck with the deep respect for sincere religion in every form which they have commonly evinced. Their original conversion to Christianity was probably accompanied by less violence and bloodshed than that of any equally considerable nation in Europe ; and in spite of the fearful calamities which followed the Reformation, it is a memorable fact that not a single Protestant suffered for his religion in Ireland during all the period of the Marian persecution in England. The treatment of Bedell, during the savage outbreak of 1641, and the Act establishing liberty of conscience, passed by the Irish Parliament of 1689, in the full flush of the brief Catholic Ascendancy under James II., exhibit very remarkably this aspect of the Irish character ; and it was displayed in another form scarcely less boldly during the Quaker missions, which began towards the close of the commonwealth, and continued with little intermission for two generations.”†

The 300,000 Protestants “ murdered in cold blood, or destroyed in some other way, or expelled from their houses,” according to

* In the course of a speech which the Chief Rabbi of the Jews delivered in Dublin in 1871, he said that “ he had long been anxious for many reasons to visit this beautiful country ; and amongst others—because it was the only country in which our ancestors had not been persecuted.”—*Jewish Chronicle*, 21st July, 1871.

† Lecky, ii. 389.

Temple, “exceeds by nearly a third the estimated number of Protestants in the whole island, and it was computed that it was more than ten times the number of Protestants who were living outside walled towns where no massacre took place.”*

In 1641 and through the ensuing wars, the Protestants held Drogheda, Enniskillen, Omagh, Newtownstewart, Augher Castle, Ballyshannon, Lifford, Letterkenny, Derry, Coleraine, Larne, Antrim, Carrickfergus, Belfast, Lisburn, Newtownards, Downpatrick. Protestants were never more than thirty miles from a place of refuge.† Dundalk, Carlingford, Newry, and Armagh were retaken by the Protestants within six months.‡ The war was vigorously prosecuted for some months in Ulster resulting in nearly uniform defeat for the insurgents, and with great loss of life on their part. Ulster was not replanted with Protestants, and yet it has been and is still the most Protestant portion of Ireland.§ These facts are wholly inconsistent with the idea that the Protestants of the north had been materially weakened in numbers by a general massacre.

While Cromwell's courts-martial condemned to death 200 persons in the other provinces, in which it has never been alleged that a general massacre of Protestants took place, in Ulster, where a massacre throwing into the shade the Sicilian Vespers and the massacre of St. Bartholomew was said to have been perpetrated, only one man, Sir Phelim O'Neill, was found guilty and executed.||

The following narrative by the Rev. Alexander Clogy, a Protestant clergyman (according to Dr. McDonnell “prejudiced even savagely against Irish Roman Catholics”), also tells strongly against any desire of the Irish to murder all who were in their power. A party had come to terms with the insurgents, stipulating that they should march out with some arms, and all their movable goods that they could carry away with them, by horse or cart towards Dublin :—

* Lecky, ii. 149. † McDonnell, 52. ‡ Ib. 127. § Ib. 178. || Ib. 178.

“So, on the 15th day of June, 1642, in the eighth month after the rebellion, we marched away, above 1,200 men, women, and children, after they had eaten the cow’s hides which had covered their cabins and huts from Christmas till June. A sad company of poor people we were, as ever were seen together; some loaden with children, some great with child, some with two children on their backs, many with two little ones in their arms, yet all rejoicing in the Lord for our enlargement at last. About 2,000 rebels accompanied us for our lifeguard, according to the articles of our agreement, which were written by Archdeacon Price (before mentioned), but now Archbishop of Cashel. The Scots had about 300 horse, some of them well appointed, for our guard also, under the conduct of Sir Francis Hamilton and Sir Arthur Forbes. . . . The rebels that conducted us, took solemn leave of us, being sore afraid at the sight of our English forces; they hasted away, having kept us seven nights in the open fields, without anything under or over us, but what each of us carried about us; yet they offered us no violence, save in the night when our men were weary with continual watchings they would steal away a good horse and run off, but were very civil to us all the way, and many of them wept at our parting from them that had lived so long and peaceably amongst them, as if we had been one people with them.”*

Nor was the war without incidents such as the following:—

“During these operations,” says Mr. Hill, “the adjoining church was crowded with a trembling multitude of women and children, who were every hour threatened with destruction, either by fire or famine. In their dire extremity, a good Roman Catholic priest, at great personal risk, interfered for their preservation. With difficulty he obtained permission to bring them water, and, in doing so, filled the water vessels with oatmeal, covering it with a few inches depth of water at the top. In this way he daily carried to the captives as much food as kept them alive till relief came. Tradition states that this truly good Samaritan was called Mac Glaine; but nothing is known of him save this one noble Christian act.”†

Dr. McDonnell adds:—“Gladly would I quote any similar deeds of mercy on the part of Parsons, or other of the Puritan

* Rev. Alexander Clogy’s *Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Dr. William Bedell, Lord Bishop of Kilmore*, Reprint of 1862; p. 241.

† McDonnell, 68. For a number of similar examples of the humanity of the insurgents, see Dr. Curry’s *Historical Review of the Civil Wars in Ireland*, pp. 124 to 128.

leaders in Ireland of this time ; but as far as I know there are none such to record."

The following, from the pen of Mr. Lecky, is testimony to same effect :—"Carte asserts that not more than two or three priests appear to have known of the conspiracy from the first ; and the respect and admiration which the saintly character of Bedell extorted from the rebels in the heart of Ulster, and in the fiercest period of the rebellion, is quite incompatible with the theory of a religious war. Though Bedell had been the warm friend of Sarpi and of De Dominus, who were of all men obnoxious to the Pope, though he was the first Irish bishop who engaged actively in proselytism, one of the most conspicuous and uncompromising opponents then living of the Catholic faith, he was treated by the rebels, into whose hands he fell, with uniform deference. He was allowed for nearly two months after the rebellion had broken out to remain unmolested in his own house, to celebrate his religious worship, and to protect his neighbours ; and though he was afterwards subjected for about three weeks to an easy confinement in a castle on Lough Erne, he ended his days in almost absolute liberty. During the short period of his captivity, as his biographer informs us, he and his companions had perfect liberty 'to use divine exercises of God's worship, as to pray, read, preach, and sing the songs of Zion in a strange land, as the Three Children ; though in the next room the priest was acting his Babylonish mass.' He died in February, 1642-3, while his diocese was still in the full possession of the rebels, and his dying wish to be buried beside his wife, in the churchyard of the cathedral, was conceded by the Catholic bishop. A guard of honour attended his body to the grave." *

CONCLUSION.

I must now bring to a conclusion this careful, though, within the limits assigned to me, necessarily imperfect consideration of the "Massacre of 1641." I claim to have shown that whilst

* Lecky, 167.

instances of murder and barbarity must have occurred, there is no proof of anything like a massacre, premeditated or otherwise.

Were the worst true—had our Irish Catholic fellow-countrymen two hundred and forty years ago, committed the full number of murders assigned to them—it would not alter my views regarding present Irish politics. If ever there were a justifiable rising for all that men hold dear, against tyranny and oppression, it was the War of 1641. The only matter for regret is that the oppressed Irish people then made such a poor fight of it, and were beaten, and temporarily re-enslaved.



The Irish Question.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS ARE SUPPLIED BY THE
IRISH PRESS AGENCY.

- (1) Facts for Mr. Parnell's Bill. By JOHN DILLON, M.P.
- (2) The Orange Bogey. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (3) The Chicago Convention. By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P.
- (4) The Irish Land Crisis.
By PIERCE MAHONY, M.P. AND J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (5) The "Castle" System. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (6) The Truth about '98. By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P.
- (7) Irish Industries and English Legislation.
By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (8) The Treatment of Minorities in Ireland.
By CHARLES DAWSON, EX-M.P.
- (9) An Irish Judge on the Irish Question.
With Introduction by J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- (10) Opinions of Some Protestants regarding Home Rule.
By ALFRED WEBB.
- (11) Irish Protestants and Home Rule.
By J. E. REDMOND, B.L. M.P.
- (12) The Alleged Massacre of 1641. By ALFRED WEBB.
Ulster. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- The Elections of 1885. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.
- Coercion. By J. J. CLANCY, M.P.

Price One Penny each.

A Word for Ireland. By T. M. HEALY, B.L. Price 1s.

Report on the Present State of the Irish Land Question.
By A LAND VALUER. Price 6d.

The foregoing will be sent in quantity, on favourable terms to Clubs and Associations in England, Wales, and Scotland, on application to the Irish Press Agency, 25 Parliament-street, Westminster, London.



Other Tracts in preparation.

British Home Rule Association Publications

OFFICES: 116, PALACE CHAMBERS, BRIDGE STREET, S.W., LONDON.

TWENTY REASONS FOR HOME RULE.

BECAUSE the people of Ireland almost unanimously demand it. Three provinces out of four, and a majority in the fourth, have returned Nationalist Candidates to Parliament with this express mandate.

BECAUSE seven centuries of British rule have failed to conciliate the Irish people, or to consolidate Ireland with England.

BECAUSE the English and the Irish people are two, and not one. They differ in race, in temperament, in genius, and (for the most part) in faith.

BECAUSE England and Ireland are more likely to be friends by recognising this fact than by ignoring it.

BECAUSE no Government could ignore the verdict of England at the elections on any question of vital importance; and, therefore, a like verdict ought not to be ignored in the case of Ireland.

BECAUSE the "golden rule" requires us to do to others as we would they should do to us. If the position of the two nations were reversed, there is no doubt what England would do.

BECAUSE Ireland has the same right as England to be mistress of her own destiny.

BECAUSE the over-ruling of the National verdict is an exercise of arbitrary power inconsistent with constitutional Government, and in the end fatal to it.

BECAUSE the Act of Union itself, which is only 85 years old, cannot be an essential part of an imperial system which is 700 years old.

BECAUSE the Act of Union deprived the Irish people, without their consent, and by notorious corruption, of such Self-Government as they formerly possessed.

BECAUSE national Self-Government means national progress.
Witness the development, in our own days, of even such races as those of Eastern Europe.

BECAUSE, in any case, Ireland prefers to be governed, well or ill, by herself, to being governed, well or ill, by England.

BECAUSE the refusal of justice to Ireland is more likely to produce "separation" than to avert it.

BECAUSE it is physically impossible for one assembly, sitting half the year in London, to conduct efficiently the necessary legislation of Ireland, in addition to the rest of a great empire.

BECAUSE English legislation itself is paralysed by "Irish obstruction." The choice is whether Ireland shall rule herself, or Ireland shall rule England.

BECAUSE the "Irish Vote," in and out of Parliament, at home and abroad, would be a constant source of English weakness, faction, and intrigue.

BECAUSE England can ill spare a large force for the permanent military occupation of Ireland.

BECAUSE any hope of healing the wounds of seven centuries of misrule and mistake is worth some effort, or rather, some sacrifice.

BECAUSE no other thorough and final solution is proposed by any English political party.

BECAUSE no other solution is possible. A nation which demands Self-Government must be either satisfied or suppressed. Ireland may be satisfied. Ireland cannot be suppressed.

Other Leaflets.

THREE POLICIES FOR IRELAND : Coercion, Compromise, and Conciliation. *Mr. John Morley's Election Address.*

FALLACIES ABOUT HOME RULE. 4 pages.

POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO HOME RULE. 4 pages.

These Leaflets may be obtained from Messrs. Wyman & Sons, 74, Great Queen Street, London, W.C., at the following rates: 4 pp., 8s. per thousand, or 1s. per hundred; 2 pp., 5s. per thousand, or 9d. per hundred.

British Home Rule Association Publications.

OFFICES : 116, PALACE CHAMBERS, BRIDGE STREET, LONDON, S.W.

JUSTICE AND LIBERTY FOR IRELAND.

EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECHES OF

WILFRID S. BLUNT

TO THE ELECTORS OF KIDDERMINSTER.

July, 1886.

MR. WILFRID S. BLUNT, who was very warmly received on his arrival at Kidderminster, devoted the first part of his speech to an exposition of the Irish Land question. Turning, then, to the question of Home Rule he proceeded as follows :

IRISH APPEAL TO ENGLISHMEN.

The Irish Members say: "For God's sake, Gentlemen, you have governed and misgoverned us long enough": and they ask us a question to which we have not been able to find an answer. They say: "How can you know at Westminster what are the wants and the requirements of the people in the West of Ireland? Who is there of all the members in Westminster who has gone over to Ireland and exhaustively inquired into what the people really want? How can you know what are the real necessities of the case?" The last proof is that Mr. Gladstone, with all his great good-will for Ireland, has never yet been able to find a true solution for this land problem. He has not been able to carry a sufficient number of followers with him to grant Ireland her full demands of justice in this matter. That is the great argument for Home Rule. If there are any of you who have connection with the land, who hold small tenancies—whether you are Tory or Liberal, I care not—let me ask you to sympathise with the class of unfortunate tenants in Ireland. A more unfortunate race can hardly ever have been. When I say unfortunate, I should say that they are happy so long as they are left alone, following out their own ideas. I have no pity for the tenantry

of Ireland as long as they remain unmolested; but I do pity them, from my soul, when I see them turned out of their houses and homes by the iniquitous land laws. Then it is I feel that the hour has come when the Irish people can rise up and say: "You have been the guardians of our country all these years. We have been in the position of minors under your tutelage, but you have failed to improve our condition, and now we insist upon managing our own local affairs. We love our country, and we desire to manage our affairs in accordance with our own ideas." That is an argument which Englishmen have to answer. All of you pride yourselves on managing your own affairs. Who is there here who would like the affairs of his own household relegated to another?

IRELAND'S LOVE OF ENGLISH LIBERTY.

Irishmen are now no longer children. They may have been children, owing to ignorance. We have allowed them to educate themselves. They have become politically educated, and now rank themselves among the educated of the land. They have learnt our system of liberty, and now they know how to use it. There are two points which have struck me in connection with this Irish question--two points which seem to indicate a poetical justice, a justice from on high. We, to make the Irish, if possible, forget their nation, forget their ideas of liberty, insisted upon their learning the English tongue. We thought that, if they lost their own separate language, they would forget their rights as free men. We thought that we could make them forget they were Irishmen, and could make them Englishmen like ourselves. Mark what has happened. This very education which we have given them, which we have forced upon them, has awakened in them a knowledge of their rights as a nation. They have learnt in our literature what it is to be a nation, they have learnt what are the rights of man. They have learnt that every people has a right to govern itself, according to its own desires, its own necessities. This gift of education which we have forced upon them, forces us now to give them freedom in their own country. The second instance of poetical justice, of justice from on high, I see in the return of the Irish from America. Forty years ago, after the famine, the landlords, thinking they might be able to improve their estates, cleared off the peasantry from the land. They turned whole districts into sheepwalks. They sent thousands of families away from Ireland. They thought

to make a wilderness, and they called it peace. They got rid of the tenants, they got higher rent from the farmers, who took the farms as pasture-land. And what was the consequence? These Irishmen, whom the landlords drove out and sent across the seas, made wealth for themselves in America, Australia, and other places, but especially in America ; and now these very men, or the sons of these men, who were turned out forty years ago, come back and raise the flag of Liberty in Ireland. Gentlemen, the Unionists, the Conservatives, taunt the Irish as men who are living upon American pay. But, who are those men who send over their money to help on the Irish cause? They are men of their own blood. They are Irishmen, the sons of men who were driven away in years gone by. I myself rejoice to see it. I would not throw it in the face of the Irish people, that they are receiving subsidies from America. I think the Irish in America are doing a great work in this respect.

PLEADING FOR JUSTICE.

I plead in the name of justice in this matter. It is a name of which we can never grow tired in England. It is a name reverenced and revered in this land, and which I believe has always been held sacred in this old town of Kidderminster. I appeal to the working-men, to Tories as well as to Liberals, and ask them in the name of all they revere in English history, in the name of all that is morally good and right, to help Mr. Gladstone to carry out his glorious plan of emancipation. If you return me to Parliament, you may depend upon me spending the whole of my strength in this glorious fight. I shall go to it as a soldier, a soldier of the line ; one of the rank and file in Parliament. But I am determined if I take my place, not to be a mere silent member. I shall not be contented merely to vote. I hope to be able, and I trust the goodness of my cause and the depth of my convictions will enable me to make my voice heard in Parliament. I can tell you this : That, if you return me, you will be fulfilling the hopes and wishes of a large number of persons in that unfortunate sister island of ours. They know me well. They have urged me to come forward on purpose to assist in fighting their cause. I am glad to say this because I do not ask you to return me for any personal advantage. But this is what I seek—the opportunity on the high platform which I should hold, as your representative, to be able to plead the cause of the poor and of justice, and of the outraged children of Ireland.

GOVERNMENT BY CONSENT OR BY FORCE.

There are only two ways in which nations can be governed : either by consent or force. To govern by force necessitates the keeping of the people in ignorance. From the moment you give education to the people, you cannot withhold from them their liberty. From the moment you place political power in the hands of the people, you cannot prevent them obtaining that which they wish for. The people of Ireland in old days were kept absolutely ignorant. It was a regime of force. But we have a more humane idea now. For the last three generations we have allowed—we have insisted upon Irishmen educating themselves. We have not merely allowed it, but we have insisted that they shall be educated, and now we are bound to abide by the consequences of our insistence. Again, Gentlemen, we have insisted upon the Irish having political power. We have given them the vote, the franchise. We have taught them the meaning of that vote, and how to use their power. Is it possible that, in a large body of English electors, there should be the least doubt that we should follow out the consequences of our political education ? The first use which the Irish have made of the franchise which we gave them some twelve months ago has been to demand a separate Parliament, and a separate Parliament Mr. Gladstone has resolved they shall have. Gentlemen, when I say a separate Parliament, I do not say separation from England. The two things are absolutely distinct. I hear people talk about the desire of the Irish to be separated from England. Believe me, there is no such desire, or wish, among the Irish people. I know the Irish people well. I have been travelling among them. I have mixed with those who hold the extremest views, and I know well what they think. Although they are determined, and will insist as far as it is possible, to legislate on their own affairs, there is no wish whatsoever in Ireland to have anything in the form of separation from England.

COERCION OR CONCILIATION.

Those who appeal to you on that ground, and say that this measure means separation, appeal on false issues. It is not true. The true issue lies between the beneficent rule of Mr. Gladstone and the iron rule of Lord Salisbury. It is to Mr. Gladstone's glory and his merit to have understood the truth : that to preserve the Empire, in a democratic age, and on democratic principles, it is absolutely necessary to have the consent of the people of that Empire. I cannot

believe that any of you here can doubt that liberty should be given to the Irish people—liberty to conduct their own internal affairs. I do not believe—I do not share those fears which we have heard expressed from time to time—that the Irish people will abuse that gift of liberty. The Irish people are not what they were a hundred years ago. They have now intellectual education and political education. They have united themselves to a great modern movement. And they now appeal to us to assist them in securing that power which we forced from our rulers generations ago. The Irish have never had that liberty yet; but they are going to have that liberty now: and it is Mr. Gladstone, and he alone, who will give it them. I appeal to you, therefore, to do your utmost to return him whom you have chosen as your representative of the Liberal cause in this matter. Although it is my humble self, I beg of you to support Mr. Gladstone in the great and grand struggle he is now making. I ask this not for my own individual merit. I have no claims upon you except that of an honest man pleading a cause of which he is profoundly convinced. I call upon you to return me as a soldier in that Parliament which is about to be assembled, and which will, I am convinced, confer this great boon of liberty upon the Irish people.

SEPARATE PARLIAMENTS—NOT SEPARATION.

The other day I saw that Mr. Bright, for whom I have the profoundest respect, as one of the greatest champions humanity has had, had fallen into the snare in this matter. I think we can account for it by reflecting that, perhaps, Mr. Bright has allowed the years to slip by, that he has not quite kept pace with the thoughts of the nation in the same way that Mr. Gladstone has. I was surprised to find Mr. Bright bringing forward an argument against the Home Rule Bill to the effect, that the creation of two Parliaments in two countries that were contiguous would destroy the unity of the Empire; that it would be a danger to the economy of both. Well, Gentlemen, can anything be so foolish? All knowledge of the facts refute such arguments. If Mr. Bright had ever travelled in the United States, in Australia, or in the Colonies of the English Empire, he would not have been frightened by the idea that two Parliaments were a great danger to the Empire. I should like to know whether any of you who have been in Australia know what exists there. There are there no less than five separate Parliaments. These Parliaments are absolutely independent of each other, and the common bond is that of

the British Empire. There exists no enmity among them. They do not quarrel with each other. There is no danger whatsoever. And yet there is a separate Parliament in each province, and all are living together in harmony, and the Empire is not in the least disturbed by it. I tell you this argument because I hope you will repeat it to your friends, and to those weak-kneed Liberals, if any now exist, who are afraid to support Mr. Gladstone in his Home Rule Bill. Now, Gentlemen, let me assure you that the idea of separation is a thing which does not exist among the Irish themselves. It is a mere figment—a statement put forward by those who oppose Mr. Gladstone, with the view of damaging his cause. It is not a true argument. The Irish themselves do not talk of separation. I have travelled all through Ireland, and have never heard a single word of that sort ; and for that reason, I hope you will refute this foolish argument.

THE " LOYAL " MINORITY.

Then, there is the talk about the danger to the loyal minority. I do not know, Gentlemen, whether you, who have professed Liberal views all your lives, are frightened with the idea of the minority not being able to take care of themselves. That a minority should be able to protect itself lies at the root and foundation of all our English system and constitutional procedure. This loyal minority boast that they are the most intellectual, the most wealthy, the most energetic people in Ireland. They also say, which is not I believe a fact, that they number two millions out of the four and half millions ; and yet they say they cannot protect themselves against the majority who are Home Rulers. I ask any of you, who know how Parliamentary Government is managed, whether there is any ground for such fears? The minority will be fully able to take care of themselves. If they possess the spirit they talk about, and that intelligence and wealth, that intellectual force and energy of character we hear of, you can rest assured that they will be able to protect themselves, and that no harm will come to them from having a Home Parliament in Dublin. My own opinion is, that unless these Ulster people have entirely exaggerated their own importance, they are precisely the people who will take the lead in the Home Rule movement when it is decided that there shall be a Parliament in Dublin. Of course, they will not take that lead at present ; and as long as they are encouraged by statesmen in England, they will continue to raise the flag of loyal-treachery, if I may so term it. The truth about these Ulster people is, that it is

entirely a question of class privilege. What they are fighting for is not equality, nor liberty, nor any fear they have of the majority; but that they may defend their class privileges. I wonder what you would say if it were here as it is in Ulster—because the majority in Ulster are Home Rulers—if the Home Rulers could only get a proportion of one magistrate appointed to twelve of the other class? The truth is, that all positions are held by the dominant class, and they are fighting for that old ascendancy which has been destroyed time out of mind in England.

JUSTICE AND LIBERTY FOR THE MAJORITY.

Here in England, again and again, the battle has been fought by the people, and they have always proved victorious. The Irish people have never, until now, had an opportunity of advocating their rights. It is the people—not the upper classes, as they are called,—who are rising up now and asking for Home Rule, and if you have any sympathy in your hearts—and I know the working men of Kidderminster have such sympathy—you will join with the peasantry of Ireland, who have been so long under the rule of the dominant and upper classes, and do what you can to secure for them justice and liberty. There is nothing to fear about the unity of the Empire being destroyed, or that the minority will suffer any wrong. If you abandon the majority, you are abandoning those who are working people like yourselves. Do you think there never was a minority in England against which the majority rebelled? The majority in England have rebelled over and over again, and have always proved in the end victorious. This is a question where the democracy of Ireland appeals to the democracy of England to help them against the upper classes. That is the true question, and that is why, from Lord Salisbury downwards, they take the side of the Ulster minority. I put it, therefore, on the basis of justice and liberty. These are two words to which one may appeal in any company, before any audience in this country. For liberty and for justice I appeal, and as Mr. Gladstone has put himself at the head of this grand movement, I appeal to you, heartily to support Mr. Gladstone. If you do me the honour of returning me to Parliament, it is Mr. Gladstone I should support. I believe in Mr. Gladstone, because he has taken up the cause of liberty and justice. It is a cause that will always succeed in this country; and, please God, it shall also succeed in Ireland.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE British Home Rule Association.

PAMPHLETS.

1. IRELAND AND HOME RULE. A Speech delivered at Newcastle-on-Tyne, November 25, 1885. *By Joseph Cowen, M.P.* 40th thousand. 20 pages. Price 1d., or £2. per thousand.
2. ARGUMENTS AGAINST HOME RULE ANSWERED. A letter to Mr. Gladstone. *By the Earl of Ashburnham.* Together with Mr. Gladstone's Reply. 6th thousand. 8 pages. Price ½d., or £1. per thousand.

TRACTATES.

1. MR. COWEN'S SPEECH on the Second Reading of the Government of Ireland Bill, in the House of Commons, June 7, 1886. 4 pages. 15th thousand. Price 10s. per thousand, or 1s. 3d. per hundred.
2. XII ARGUMENTS FOR HOME RULE. *By Orby Shipley, M.A.* 4 pages. 5th thousand. Price 10s. per thousand, or 1s. 3d. per hundred.
3. MR. DISRAELI ON THE IRISH QUESTION IN 1843, 1844, and 1868. 5 pages. 5th thousand. Price 10s. per thousand, or 1s. 3d. per hundred.
4. JUSTICE AND LIBERTY FOR IRELAND. Extract from the speeches of WILFRID S. BLUNT. 7 pages. 5th thousand. Price 10s. per thousand, or 1s. 3d. per hundred.

LEAFLETS.

1. TWENTY REASONS FOR HOME RULE. 2 pages. 35th thousand. Price 5s. per thousand, or 9d. per hundred.
2. FALLACIES ABOUT HOME RULE. 4 pages. 25th thousand. Price 8s. per thousand, or 1s. per hundred.
3. POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO HOME RULE. 4 pages. 25th thousand. Price 8s. per thousand, or 1s. per hundred.
4. THREE POLICIES FOR IRELAND: Coercion, Compromise, Conciliation. Election Address. 1886. *By the Right Hon. John Morley, M.P.* 2 pages. 5th thousand. Price 5s. per thousand, or 9d. per hundred.
5. COERCION FOR TWENTY YEARS. *By T. D. Sullivan, M.P.* (Reprinted from *The Nation*). 2 pages. 5th thousand. Price 5s. per thousand, or 9d. per hundred.

Object of the Association; its Constitution and Rules; Account of its Establishment; Report of its First General Meeting; and a Form of Petition to the House of Commons in favour of a Parliament in Ireland—may be had on application at the Offices.

1474

British Home Rule Association
Publications

No. 1

Pr. 1d

IRELAND AND HOME
RULE

SPEECH DELIVERED AT NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE

25 NOVEMBER 1885

BY

JOSEPH COWEN M.P.

TWENTIETH THOUSAND

REVISED

London

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICES OF THE ASSOCIATION
116, PALACE CHAMBERS, BRIDGE STREET, S.W.
SOLD BY WYMAN & SONS, 74, GREAT QUEEN STREET, W.C.
M. H. GILL & SON, DUBLIN; AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

1886

British Home Rule Association.

SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS UPON THE IRISH QUESTION.

The Publication Committee of the British Home Rule Association, in directing the attention of its members and others to recent publications, does not hold itself responsible for every opinion and statement, whether political or religious, which may be expressed by the several authors in the following works.

Irish Essays and Others. By MATTHEW ARNOLD, M.A.
London: *Smith, Elder & Co.*, 15, Waterloo Place. 1882. Price 7s. 6d.

**Edmund Burke: Letters, Speeches and Tracts on
IRISH AFFAIRS.** Edited by MATTHEW ARNOLD, M.A. London: *Macmillan & Co.*, 29, Bedford Street. 1881. Price 6s.

Lectures on Faith and Fatherland. By Very REV. THOMAS N. BURKE, O.P. *New Edition.* Glasgow: *Cameron & Ferguson*, 88, West Nile Street. (No date.) Price 1s.

Refutation of Froude; and other Lectures. By Very REV. THOMAS N. BURKE, O.P. *New Edition.* Glasgow: *Cameron & Ferguson*, 88, West Nile Street. (No date.) Price 1s.

Irish Federalism: its Meaning, its Objects and its Hopes.
By the late ISAAC BUTT, Q.C., M.P. *Fourth Edition.* Dublin: *Office of the Irish Home Rule League*, 29, Lower Sackville Street. 1874. Price 1s.

Ireland and Home Rule. By JOSEPH COWEN, M.P. *Twentieth Thousand.* Published by the British Home Rule Association. London: *Wyman & Sons*, 74, Great Queen Street. 1886. Price 1d.

**Case of Ireland stated: a Plea for my People and my
RACE.** By M. F. CUSACK. Dublin: *M. H. Gill & Son*, 50, Upper O'Connell Street. 1881. Price 3s. 6d.

Irish Policy for a Liberal Government. By T. A. DICKSON, sometime M.P. Published by the Committee on Irish Affairs. London: *Wyman & Sons*, 74, Great Queen Street. 1885. Price 1d.

Birds Eye View of Irish History. By SIR C. GAVAN DUFFY, K.C.M.G. Dublin: *Duffy & Sons*, 15, Wellington Quay. 1882. Price 2s.

Truth about Ireland. By an ENGLISH LIBERAL. London: *Kegan Paul, & Co.*, 1, Paternoster Square. 1884. Price 6d.

Summary of Irish Grievances still existing in 1886. By EDMUND HARVEY. *Fourth thousand.* Waterford: *Published by the Author.* To be had, with other small publications, gratis, on application to Edmund Harvey, Esq., The Grange, Waterford, Ireland.

Loyalty plus Murder. By T. M. HEALY, M.P. Dublin: *M. H. Gill & Son*, 50, Upper O'Connell Street. 1884. Price 6d.

Letters of an Irish Catholic Layman; an Examination of the Present State of Irish Affairs. Dublin: *Nation Office*, 90, Middle Abbey Street. 1884. Price 1s.

Home Rule. By LEX. Dublin: *Duffy & Sons*, 15, Wellington Quay. 1884. Price 3s.

Plea for the Home Government of Ireland. By JOHN GEORGE MACCARTHY, sometime M.P. *Third Edition*. Dublin: *Nation Office*, 90, Middle Abbey Street. 1872. Price 1s.

Arguments for and against Home Rule. By REV. MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A., Canon of Ripon. London: *Routledge & Sons*, Broadway, Ludgate Hill. 1886. Price 1s.

Irish Parliament: what it Was, and what it Did. By J. G. SWIFT MACNEILL, M.A. London: *Cassell & Co.*, La Belle Sauvage Yard, Ludgate Hill. 1886. Price 1s.

Outline of Irish History. By J. H. McCARTHY, M.P. London: *Chatto & Windus*, 214, Piccadilly. 1883. Price 1s.

Irish Nationality in 1870. By a Protestant Celt (ROBERT McDONNELL, F.R.S.) *Second Edition*. Dublin: *Ponsonby*, 116, Grafton Street. 1870. Price 1s.

Imperial Taxation: the Case of Ireland plainly stated. By Sir JOSEPH MCKENNA, M.P. London: *Rivingtons*, 3, Waterloo Place. 1883. Price 1s.

England and Ireland. By JOHN STUART MILL. *Sixth Edition*. London: *Longmans & Co.*, 39, Paternoster Row. Price 1s.

Apology for the British Government in Ireland. By the late JOHN MITCHEL. *New Edition*. Dublin: *J. J. Lalor*, 3, North Earl Street. 1882. Price 6d.

Ireland; a Book of Light on the Irish Problem. By various Authors. Edited by ANDREW REID. London: *Longmans & Co.*, 39, Paternoster Row. 1886. Price 2s. 6d.

New Views on Ireland: Irish Land, Grievances, Remedies. By Sir CHARLES RUSSELL, Q.C., M.P., H.M. Attorney-General. *Third Edition*. London: *Macmillan & Co.*, 29, Bedford Street. 1881. Price 2s. 6d.

New Ireland: Political Sketches and Personal Reminiscences. By the late A. M. SULLIVAN, M.P. *Ninth Edition*. Glasgow: *Cameron & Ferguson*, 88, West Nile Street. 1882. Price 1s.

Ireland's Wrongs, and how to mend them: a Letter to the MIDDLE CLASS AND OPERATIVE ELECTORS. By Rev. JOHN T. WALTERS, M.A., Rector of Norton. London: *Hodder & Stoughton*, 27, Paternoster Row. 1881. Price 6d.

N.B.—The Works are arranged in the Alphabetical order of their Authors' names.

British Home Rule Association.

PROVISIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Chairman.

THE EARL OF ASHBURNHAM, 30, Dover Street, W.

Vice-Chairman.

JOSEPH COWEN, Esq., M.P., 23, Onslow Square, S.W.

Committee.

BLUNT, Wilfrid S., Esq., 10, James Street,
Buckingham Gate, S.W.
CLARK, G. B., Esq., M.D., Fenwick,
West Dulwich, S.E.
CLIFTON, Lord, Dumpton, Ramsgate.
EDMUND, W. MARTIN-, Esq., 24, Great
Cumberland Place, W.
JONES, Rev. J. S., Vicarage, St. Philip's,
Clerkenwell, W.C.

KENYON, John G., Esq., 24, Dorset Square,
N.W.
LUCAS, Edward, Esq., Fern Lodge, Brook
Green, Hammersmith, W.
MARSHALL, Sir James, Richmond House,
Roehampton Park, S.W.
SHIPLEY, Orby, Esq., 39, Thurloe Square, S.W.
THOMPSON, Thomas C., Esq., Ashdown Park,
Forest Row, Sussex.

(With power to add to their number.)

Joint Honorary Treasurers.

Sir James MARSHALL; and Thomas C. THOMPSON, Esq.

Joint Honorary Secretaries.

W. MARTIN-EDMUND, Esq.; E. W. HOPE, Esq.; and John G. KENYON, Esq.
(To whom all communications may be addressed.)

116, Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, Westminster, S.W.

Publication Sub-Committee.

Rev. J. S. JONES; E. LUCAS, Esq.; and Orby SHIPLEY, Esq.
(To whom communications may be addressed.)

Bankers.

THE NATIONAL BANK (Limited), Charing Cross Branch. 9 and 10, Charing Cross, S.W.

Offices of the Association.

116, PALACE CHAMBERS, BRIDGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

THE BRITISH HOME RULE ASSOCIATION

HAS been founded for the purpose of enabling Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Welshmen, who are in favour of Home Rule for Ireland, to express and propagate their opinions. The founders of the Association are convinced that the time has come when the Irish question must be settled; and they hold that no settlement of it can be just, politic, or permanent unless it be in accordance with the will of the Irish people. They are bound by constitutional usage to accept, as the authorised exponents of the national will, the majority of the lawfully-elected representatives of Ireland. They note, that 85 out of 103 of those representatives have declared in favour of a Parliament in Ireland. They, therefore—being moreover of opinion that the establishment of such a Parliament would in no way imperil the supremacy of the Crown, the integrity of the Empire, or the security of private property—are prepared to advocate and to support by all constitutional means the solution of the question.

Subscriptions will be received by the joint Honorary Treasurers, Sir James Marshall and Thomas C. Thompson, Esq.; or by the joint Honorary Secretaries, W. Martin-Edmunds, Esq., E. W. Hope, Esq., and John G. Kenyon, Esq.

The following is the First List of Subscriptions promised at a private meeting of the founders of the Association, February 10th, 1886.

	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Wilfrid S. Blunt, Esq. ...	50 0 0	Edward, Bishop of Nottingham ...
Joseph Cowen, Esq., M.P. ...	50 0 0	Lord Clifton ...
Edward Lucas, Esq. ...	5 0 0	The Earl of Ashburnham ...
W. Martin-Edmunds, Esq. ...	20 0 0	James Britten, Esq. ...
John G. Kenyon, Esq. ...	5 0 0	T. Bateman Napier, Esq., LL.D. ...
Orby Shipley, Esq. ...	5 0 0	Sir James Marshall ...
W. H. R. Ashford, Esq. ...	2 10 0	L. G. Greenbergh, Esq. ...
Caithness Brodie, Esq. ...	5 0 0	Rev. J. S. Jones ...
Thomas C. Thompson, Esq. ...	10 0 0	E. W. Hope, Esq. ...

Post-Office Orders may be made payable at Charing Cross, and, together with Cheques and Postal Orders, may be crossed "National Bank (Limited), Charing Cross."

DATE DUE

UNIVERSITY PRODUCTS, INC. #859-5503

BOSTON COLLEGE



3 9031 021 50483 2

BOUND BY
WILLIAM LEWIS,
SELLER & STATIONER,
DUKE STREET,
CARDIFF.

